DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 742 FL 019 241

AUTHOR Ridley, Jennifer
TITLE Strategic Competence in Second Language Performance: A Study of Four Advanced Learners. CLCS Occasional Paper No. 28.
INSTITUTION Trinity Coll., Dublin (Ireland). Centre for Language and Communication Studies.
REPORT NO ISSN-0332-3889
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 99p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Communication Skills; *Coping; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Individual Differences; *Intercultural Communication; *Metalinguistics; *Native Speakers; Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Learning; Self Evaluation (Individuals)
IDENTIFIERS *Strategic Competence (Languages)

ABSTRACT

A study investigated how learners of a second language cope with the linguistic difficulties in oral interaction with a native speaker. The four subjects were training to become bilingual secretaries and were faced with job interviews. The study's objectives were: (1) to analyze the subjects' oral performance and show that learners differ widely in their use of communication strategies; and (2) to assess the practicality of using learners' introspection to promote their awareness of the role that compensation strategies can play in oral performance. The subjects were interviewed twice in the target language (French), once before and once after a 6-month period in France or Belgium. Immediately following each interview, each subject was asked to comment on her performance. Results confirmed the emergence of differential coping strategies in the four subjects, and found greater disparity between the styles in the second interview. Results also indicate that learners vary in their ability to recall or verbalize these processes and in their degree of linguistic awareness during and after the oral performances. Transcripts of the interviews and introspections are appended, and an 82-item bibliography is included. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED333742

TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

Centre for Language and Communication Studies

Strategic competence in second language performance: a study of four advanced learners

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Jennifer Ridley

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ridley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CLCS Occasional Paper No. 28

ISSN 0332 3889

Spring 1991

FL019241

2

CLCS Occasional Papers

General Editor: D. G. Little

CLCS Occasional Papers report on research carried out within or in association with the Centre for Language and Communication Studies, and on research carried out elsewhere which is of special interest to the Centre's own concerns and activities. In some instances they present the texts of public lectures promoted by the Centre.

The following titles have been published and are available from The Secretary, Centre for Language and Communication Studies, Trinity College, Dublin 2.

Autumn 1981

1. D. M. Singleton, *Language transfer: a review of some recent research* (31pp.)
2. Jeffrey L. Kallen, *Linguistics and oral tradition: the structural study of the riddle* (33pp.)
3. D. M. Singleton, *Age as a factor in second language acquisition* (70pp.) - OUT OF PRINT

Summer 1982

4. Francis Nolan, *Voice quality and speech synthesis* (30pp.)
5. Roger Bennett, *Language elicitation procedures* (23pp.)

Winter 1982-3

6. S. M. Devitt, D. G. Little, S. P. O Conchúir & D. M. Singleton, *Learning Irish with Anois is Arís* (128pp.) - OUT OF PRINT

Autumn 1983

7. William T. Littlewood, *A communicative approach to language-teaching methodology* (19pp.)
8. Rose Maclaran, *On the interaction of semantics and pragmatics* (18pp.)
9. E. M. Harding, *Compensation strategies* (54pp.)

Autumn 1984

10. Jeffrey L. Kallen, *Generative phonology in the clinic* (38pp.)
11. Gearóid O Ciaráin, *The affective dimension in second/foreign language learning: an interactional perspective* (42pp.)

Spring 1985

12. D. M. Singleton & D. G. Little, *Foreign languages at second level: defining a syllabus, with particular reference to the needs of the senior cycle* (19pp.)
13. John Harris, *The polylectal grammar stops here* (12pp.)

(Continued on inside back cover)

CLCS Occasional Paper No.28
Spring 1991

Strategic competence in second language performance: a study of four advanced learners*

by

Jennifer Ridley

0 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study was to find out about how learners of a second language (L2) cope when faced with linguistic difficulties in oral interaction with a native speaker (as opposed to with another learner). The four subjects who took part in the study were training to become 'bilingual' secretaries at a college in Dublin. At the end of the two-year course they would have to compete for jobs in France or Belgium and be interviewed in the target language. My job was to prepare them for these interviews, and to see that they were capable of sustaining oral output even when faced with linguistic difficulties.

I had previously observed with similar learner groups in the college that students developed their own ways of coping orally with lack of linguistic knowledge. In particular, those students who had spent six months of the training period working as au pairs with French or Belgian families seemed to have developed, on their return, their own distinctive communicative style. They varied greatly in the types of communication strategies they used in order to overcome what were usually lexical problems. The different strategies which were used in a compensatory way showed up on the taped recordings of the mock L2 interviews held in class. However, the students themselves did not always hear the differences in the communicative styles.

It seemed clear that, if strategic competence was going to be taught as part of a structured teaching programme, then all the learners had to be aware of the concept and use of communication strategies. They would also have to be able to express themselves in metalinguistic terms.

With this context in mind, the study set out with two objectives. The first was to analyse samples of the subjects' oral performance and to test the hypothesis that

---

* An earlier version of this paper was submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the M.Phil. in Applied Linguistics, Trinity College, Dublin, September 1989

learners (who, at least on paper, have been shown to have similar levels of formal mastery of a language) differ widely in their use of communication strategies, and naturally develop tendencies to use one kind of strategy or another.

The second objective was to assess the practicality of using learners' introspection as a means of making them more aware of the nature of their communication problems in L2, and as a means of raising their awareness of the role that compensation strategies can play in oral performance. The four subjects in this study had never before been required to comment on their own performances, and in the experiment they did so with varying degrees of success. Nevertheless, their introspective reports helped to provide an extra dimension to my assessment of their individual coping styles.

The four subjects were interviewed in the target language twice: once before they left for the six-month period in France or Belgium and again shortly after their return to Ireland. Throughout the discussion these two occasions are referred to as Stage One and Stage Two. The transcriptions of all the interviews are given in the Appendix. It must be emphasised that the orthography representing their speech was at times my own interpretation of their interlanguage. I decided to transcribe their output as it had been spoken, i.e. with clearly audible errors. Therefore the gambit used by Subject 2 is transcribed as: 'tous les choses comme ça' and Subject 4's expression 'j'ai metté (instead of 'j'ai mis') appears as it was spoken.

Immediately after each interview at both stages, each subject was asked to introspect on her performance; the transcriptions of the introspective reports of Stages One and Two are given in the Appendix and in the body of the discussion respectively.

The first section of the paper provides a theoretical framework which offers a context for the empirical part of the study. It begins by defining the Chomskyan distinction between competence and performance. Then the broader notion of communicative competence is explored and the role of pragmatic and grammatical competence in advanced learners' interlanguage is discussed. Learners' problems in performance are outlined, first within the framework of procedural knowledge and, more narrowly, within the concept of strategic competence. Finally, criteria are established which form the basis for the identification of those communication strategies and other performance features which were used in the study to describe each subject's coping style.

The second section describes and justifies the methodology used in the study.

The third section introduces the four subjects and then analyses the data elicited from them at Stage One.

The fourth section reports briefly on how the subjects had generally fared during the six-month period abroad and then analyses the data collected at Stage Two. A comparison is made between the coping styles of each subject at both stages, and also between the different ways each subject tended to cope. It was found that each subject had, during the period of immersion in the L2 environment, developed her

distinctive methods of compensating for linguistic difficulties. Secondly, it was found that there was great disparity in each subject's level of metalinguistic awareness.

Finally, the fifth section gives some concluding remarks on the findings made in the study and outlines the implications they may have for teaching strategic competence in the classroom.

1 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1.1 The Chomskyan approach to competence and performance

As was stated in the Introduction, the focus of this study is on the development of effective second language use. Clearly, good performance is dependent on sound grammatical knowledge, but the main interest here is in proficient oral interaction. This slant is an example of what Lightbown (1984, p.242) calls a social psychological approach. This is in contrast to a Chomskyan approach where the focus is on the understanding of universal characteristics of language learning. However, a brief consideration of Chomsky's distinction between competence and performance is necessary in order to put into context a wider model of communicative competence in which strategic competence has a place.

Chomsky (1965, p.3) is of the view that competence and performance must be regarded as completely separate. Competence in the Chomskyan sense is an idealised complete knowledge of a system of grammatical rules. Actual performance is an imperfect use of the system; imperfect because speakers in performance are not in an idealised state. Factors which influence performance are largely psychological, such as 'memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors' (Chomsky 1965, p.3). Chomsky (1980) later modified the concept of performance, and introduced the notion of pragmatic competence. This notion, according to Sharwood Smith (1983, p.193), is still 'fundamentally psychological in character', in that it does not include the idea of social context.

Linguists investigating second language acquisition who follow the Chomskyan approach tend to ignore performance data. This is because they are primarily interested in learners' formal mastery of a language. In so far as investigations have used performance data, this data has not been the main focus. For example, Adjemian (1976), following the Chomskyan model, does recognize the role that communication strategies play in an analysis of interlanguage, but he states that strategies should not be used as 'descriptive tools' (p.313).

Such an approach is clearly inappropriate here. We need to understand why there is often a mismatch between a learner's underlying grammatical competence and his ability to use this knowledge, and how this disparity can be overcome. It seems that the communication strategies used to bridge this gap are the key to such an understanding. We shall therefore turn to a broader, more holistic theoretical framework which includes a sociolinguistic dimension and which sees communi-

cative performance as an end in itself rather than merely an imperfect manifestation of grammatical competence.

1.2 Communicative competence: Canale and Swain's theoretical framework

The framework proposed by Canale and Swain (1980) is broader than the Chomskyan model described in the previous section. It is also more learner-centred because it takes into account how learners cope when they are in linguistic difficulties. The framework does, however, retain a distinction between the notions of competence and performance. They are widened to embrace real life communication. Communicative competence is both linguistic knowledge and skill in using this knowledge (Canale and Swain 1980, p.7). The term communicative performance is renamed 'actual communication' by Canale (1983, p.5), who defines it as 'realization of such knowledge and skill under limiting conditions'.

This theory takes into account those limiting conditions inherent in actual performance which the Chomskyan model dismisses as trivial. It also addresses the ways in which a learner can bridge the gap between underlying competence and actual performance. Canale (1983, p.6) calls such an ability a skill—'how well one can perform knowledge in actual situations'. This skill is the central theme of this study. The data analysis takes into account aspects of performance such as memory limitations and lack of attention. They are sometimes identifiable through the use of introspective learner data.

Communicative competence, according to Canale and Swain (1980), is made up of three components: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence. Canale (1983) includes the component discourse competence. Grammatical competence is defined as knowledge of a linguistic system, which includes syntax, phonology, and lexis. Sociolinguistic competence takes into account the context of performance and the text type. Discourse competence is the ability to combine form and meaning. The nature of interaction of these components is not known, as Canale (1983, p.6) points out. For one thing there are other cognitive factors which contribute to a learner's communicative competence which are not language-specific, for example, world knowledge. What is clear, which this study will demonstrate, is the role of strategic competence in relation to the other competencies. It is used when the other competences fail. This role will be discussed later in the chapter. First we need to take a closer look at the sociolinguistic and grammatical dimensions of competence in terms of how they are applied in performance by advanced learners such as the subjects in this study.

1.3 Pragmatic competence and grammatical competence in the advanced learner

Sociolinguistic competence is defined by Canale and Swain (1980, p.6) as 'knowledge of the rules of language'. This definition is similar to Hymes' (1971)

theory of the 'acceptability' or 'appropriacy' of utterances in a given context (although Hymes was concerned with L1 competence). In the case of our learners an awareness of what is appropriate in a sociocultural sense is manifested in appropriate register, for example. What is expected to present greater problems is the discourse itself; the interview was designed to put the learners in a linguistic tight corner. Discourse competence is defined by Canale (1983) as 'the mastery of how to combine grammatical forms and meanings to achieve a unified spoken or written text in different genres' (p.9). Discourse competence is more context-embedded than the broader sociolinguistic competence described above. We shall refer to them both as pragmatic competence.

One feature of this study which must be taken into account is that our subjects were already fairly advanced linguistically and in maturation. Their cognitive capacities were reasonably developed, and they were found to be communicatively competent in L1 interviews in class. It seems therefore reasonable to ask to what extent their pragmatic competence and the metalinguistic awareness they had already acquired in their second language learning might influence their ability to perform well in the given task here.

The question of the effect of L1 pragmatic knowledge on L2 communication is raised by Faerch and Kasper (1983b, p.235), but empirical evidence is not given. Blum-Kulka (1982) reports on a study of speech-act performance in advanced second language learners. She concludes that the development of pragmatic competence in L2 is relative to the level of grammatical competence which the learner has acquired. She says (p.151): 'Once he [the learner] acquires a certain level of linguistic competence [...] the pragmatic, non-linguistic component of his general communicative competence will enable him to relate linguistic information to situational context.' Contrasting evidence of adult learners' success in using innate pragmatic competence is found in the results of a teaching experiment by Savignon (1972). She demonstrates that L2 beginners with very limited grammatical competence can communicate effectively because of sociolinguistic and strategic capacities (Yalden 1987, p.21).

However, other studies of adult learners have shown that learners vary in their ability to transfer L1 pragmatic competence into an L2 context. Raupach (1987), in a study of advanced second language learners' procedural knowledge, concludes that the ways in which the learner is exposed to the foreign language is one factor in learner variability (p.148). Littlewood (1981) describes different types of learners (p.155). One type 'enters the foreign sociolinguistic system and transfers his L1 concept of stylistic variation into L2 performance'. The empirical study here shows how four learners who are exposed to the target language for the same amount of time in similar environments (i.e., living with French-speaking families) widely differ in their communicative speech styles when they return.

One feature of the subjects' discourse competence which was analysed was their use of appropriate fillers. Fillers can be seen as coping strategies (for example,

to play for time when a rule of lexis fails) or as evidence of discourse competence. Schiffrin (1987, p.40) gives an account of the use of *well* or *I mean* in L1. The learner must acquire appropriate use of L2 equivalents. However, this is clearly not always easy. Littlewood (1979, p.131) describes the difficulties faced by performance in L2. One problem is that the speaker 'is less familiar with the discourse-organizing devices of the foreign communicative situation'. In this study there was wide variance displayed in the acquisition and use of appropriate fillers.

Fillers and other coping strategies might be used when grammatical knowledge fails, as we have seen. The relationship between declarative knowledge and procedural knowledge is complex, as the next section will show; it partly depends on unconscious cognitive processes. Whether more advanced learners are more proficient at producing the right form in performance than younger L2 learners is a matter for speculation.

There have been several studies on the influence of language universals on L2 acquisition. Felix (1984) proposes that the Chomskyan concept of the language acquisition device is linked to maturation and the acquisition of L2 grammatical rules. Such studies lead Towell (1987, p.161) to pose the question: why is it that the advanced learner, whose cognitive capacities are developed, does not utilize them as efficiently in L2 performance as in L1. Cook (1985, p.11) is of the view that learners are unable to transfer channel capacity (i.e. those cognitive abilities which are a factor in language use) automatically from the L1 situation to that of L2.

Accepting Cook's view, it could be argued that the advanced learner must relearn how to maximize his non-linguistic cognitive capacities in conjunction with the second language learning process. Ellis (1985, p.108) proposes that more advanced learners can consciously apply their formally learnt linguistic rules. He says: 'Older learners can learn about language by consciously studying linguistic rules. They can also apply these rules when they use the language.' Ellis cites a study by Rosanksy (1975), in which the notion 'meta-awareness' is thought to play a part in older learners' second language acquisition. In our study the subjects were asked to describe their linguistic problems in metalinguistic terms. It seems that this was a reasonable thing to do, given their advanced state of formal learning. It was seen that one of the subjects showed very little evidence of metalinguistic awareness; at any rate, she could not describe how she gained access to a grammatical form. This grey area between 'knowing that' and 'knowing how' is discussed next.

1.4 The relationship between declarative and procedural knowledge

This section outlines theories about psychological processes which take place in language learning and production, in particular those of Krashen (1981, 1982), McLaughlin (1978, 1987), and Bialystok and Sharwood Smith (1985). Although

different in approach and in the hypotheses made, they all raise the question of learner consciousness and control in L2 production. The degree of consciousness which a learner has in his use of procedural knowledge is central to an understanding of his strategic competence, and provides a basis on which to build a justification of the use of introspection in the empirical study here. A second question which is raised in defining the relationship between declarative and procedural knowledge is the process of internalisation and automatisation of rules and phrases, and the role that automatisation plays in a learner's ability to communicate fluently.

First a definition is needed which describes declarative and procedural knowledge in a way which is particularly relevant to this discussion. Faerch and Kasper (1987, p.12) give such a definition: they make a link between the use of procedural knowledge and actual performance. They state: 'Declarative linguistic knowledge comprises IL [i.e. interlanguage] rule knowledge at all linguistic levels, [...] organised in more or less analysed, i.e. structurally transparent and articulated form. [...] In order to activate such knowledge in communication, and to increase it through learning, we assume a second type of knowledge, intervening between the declarative and (observable) performance: procedural knowledge.'

From this definition it emerges that we are dealing with (i) an interaction between an underlying knowledge of linguistic rules and the knowledge of how to use that system; and (ii) the realisation of that interaction at performance level. Procedural knowledge therefore is not the same as performance, it is one level below the surface of actual communication. Sometimes procedural knowledge requires the activation of grammatical rules; sometimes it involves a pragmatic dimension. Bialystok (1982, p.205) points out that 'knowing a form [...] does not ensure that the form will be used in appropriate situations'.

Different theories of the ways in which an L2 learner copes with imbalances of knowledge are bound to be highly speculative and meet with much disagreement. One such theory is Krashen's Monitor theory (1981, 1982), which is chiefly concerned with second language acquisition, but also addresses the problems that learners face in performing L2. Krashen's hypothesis is that the learner possesses two kinds of knowledge, implicit and explicit knowledge. Unlike Faerch and Kasper's definition of procedural and declarative knowledge, in which the two kinds of knowledge are said to interact along a kind of continuum, Krashen's theory claims that the two types are completely separate in origin and at the performance level. The implicit knowledge system, according to Krashen, is acquired typically, but not exclusively, in informal environments. In performance the learner initiates utterances using only his implicit knowledge. At the same time he can use his formally learned knowledge system (his explicit knowledge) to monitor or edit output. The Monitor, however, can be used in practice only when the learner has time and enough attention to focus on a grammatical rule. In other words, the Monitor is not used in the sense of intuitively 'feeling' that an utterance is correct

or not; it is more consciously applied. Tarone (1988, p.28) points out that in the Monitor theory it is possible for the learner to self-correct using his implicit knowledge system, but this monitoring (with a small 'm') is not the main focus of the Monitor theory.

Krashen's theory that the learner edits output in a formal, grammatically based way is criticised by Morrison and Low (1983). They argue that the theory pays too little attention to the phenomenon of the learner being able to monitor 'by feel'. They argue that Krashen's theory is not broad enough; it does not take pragmatic knowledge into account. They say (p.239): 'Monitoring can take place at a number of different levels, with checks being made for social appropriateness, grammaticality, simple truth value etc.' They also claim that the learner can self-correct or monitor using his acquired system (p.244).

Krashen does not explicitly explore the question of consciousness in learner performance, but his Monitor theory implies that there is no overlap between what the learner does on an unconscious level and on a conscious level. There is no grey area in between, no continuum between implicit and explicit knowledge. Instead, the learner alternates, using one system and then the other.

Krashen's Monitor theory is tested empirically by Hulstijn and Hulstijn (1984). They find that all learners, with varying amounts of grammatical rule knowledge, need to apply attention to the task. They conclude that learners in performance use 'a dimension of executive control' (p.24). This dimension is on a continuum, ranging from controlled to automatic processes. In addition, the authors discern 'a metacognitive knowledge [...] ranging from a highly implicit to a highly explicit knowledge of the language rules' (p.25). It became apparent in this study that metacognitive knowledge was more highly developed in some subjects than in others, even though they had all reached approximately the same proficiency level—on paper at least.

Hulstijn and Hulstijn's reference to controlled and automatic processes is similar to McLaughlin's theory of language production (1978, 1987). He cites studies of language behaviour which show that controlled and automatic processes are based on 'behavioural acts, not on inner states of consciousness' (1978 p.318). McLaughlin criticizes Krashen's separation of conscious monitoring and unconscious language use, of acquisition and learning. He says (1987, p.29): '[...] there is a sense, which many learners share, that what they have consciously learned becomes the basis for unconscious and automatic performance.' In other words, McLaughlin's hypothesis is that there is a progression from conscious processes to unconscious, automatic processes. When the learner's path on that route becomes problematic, when the utterance is not internalised sufficiently to be used automatically, the learner must apply conscious attention. If the grammatical structure is not recalled, even with controlled attention, then presumably the learner must focus even more conscious attention. The introspective data in this study shows that learners vary in their attention during performance.

The importance of a learner's control in performance as shown in this study is described by Bialystok and Sharwood Smith (1985). They propose a framework for defining how interlanguage operates in actual performance (p.106). They incorporate pragmatic competence as well as grammatical competence in their concept of declarative knowledge. The interaction of declarative and procedural knowledge, according to their model, centres on the learner's control, or skill in retrieving information. This procedure is likened to retrieving the right book in a library: the learner must access his mental storage system (p.105).

This analogy is appealing because both in the recorded data of these four subjects and in the introspective data it is apparent that the ability to recall lexical items is one of the biggest stumbling blocks to oral fluency. It seems that there is also variability in the ability to recall a lexical item from one learner to another. Bialystok and Sharwood Smith (1985, p.109) expect that even learners with sound grammatical knowledge are unable sometimes to retrieve that knowledge within time constraints of oral production. Carter (1987, p.169) points out that words which are already 'known' to the learner are not immediately accessible; he speaks of memorisation as 'an ebbing and flowing process'. The problem of lexical recall is exemplified in an empirical study by Dechert (1986). From a story-telling task by advanced learners he finds that 'the real issue in advanced second language processing is the lexicon' (p.35). It was found that as our four subjects advanced in their grammatical competence, their main problem became accessing their lexicon. Dechert finds that those learners with a supply of immediately available lexical units and formulas (which he calls proceduralised linguistic units) can devote more attention to the search for declaratively stored linguistic knowledge.

Dechert's empirical study bears out what Bialystok and Sharwood Smith (1985) say about the role of learner control in fluency, namely that control (a means of retrieving information) is related to the speed at which that information is accessed. This speedy process can be helped by the availability of automatically produced linguistic units. Learner control is, however, both variable (according to the task) and difficult to analyse empirically (p.110). The authors say that control variability is easily confounded with cognitive variability, for instance, a learner's immature pragmatic competence (p.110). Tarone (1988, p.37), however, questions the whole notion of learner control as separate from a learner's knowledge system, whether grammatical or pragmatic. She is of the view that Bialystok and Sharwood Smith's distinction between knowledge and control is blurred and moreover 'remains empirically unverified'. Clearly, if learner control operates on a kind of continuum, and if some information retrieval processes are automatic while others are not, then some control procedures are recognisable to the learner and others are not. In their description of procedural knowledge, Faerch and Kasper (1987, p.12) say this with regard to cognitive processes involved in language production: 'As many of these processes are activated automatically [...] they are not available for introspective report.' It follows that what is needed here is an identification of those aspects of

procedural knowledge which are distinguishable in the L2 recorded data and learner introspection.

In order to do this we can draw on the theories outlined above which define the nature of procedural knowledge. It was mentioned at the beginning of this section that the theories address the two questions of (i) a learner's conscious awareness in L2 production and (ii) the role of automatisation in a learner's interaction of declarative and procedural knowledge. The two notions of conscious application of a rule or a strategy and the gradual automatisation of a rule or phrase operate in practice along a continuum. Both procedures combine as the learner advances towards a more proficient performance. Anderson (1983, p.39) describes this process thus: '[...] in becoming proficient in a foreign language we move from using rules of the language in a slow and conscious manner to applying them without awareness of the rules.' According to Raupach (1987, p.128), this progression is a 'gradual conversion from declaratively encoded knowledge to procedurally encoded knowledge'. In performance the learner hovers between being able automatically to use his declarative knowledge and being unable to use it. The result is hesitant and disrupted speech. A learner's ability to recall a rule or a lexical item is, as we have seen, not always reliable. How the learner copes with this temporary disruption is by using his strategic competence. According to Bialystok and Sharwood Smith (1985, p.115) there are knowledge-based strategies and control-based strategies. The first are used in a compensatory way to make up for difficulties linked to insufficient knowledge. The second are 'procedures for executing responses' and have to do with language production and execution. Both kinds of strategies will be discussed next. In our taxonomy the first kinds of strategies are called communication strategies, and the second kind are referred to as performance strategies.

1.5 The use of communication strategies in performance

As we indicated at the start of this section, it was observed in the classroom situation from which the four subjects came that similarly advanced learners seem to evolve their own different ways of coping in an L2 oral interview. In particular, those learners who spent six months in a target language country, away from a formal learning environment, seemed to use preferred communication strategies. This study set out to investigate those changes which occured in the communicative style of four subjects over this period of time. Clearly a taxonomy of strategies which were thought relevant to this context and task was needed. This, together with the data elicitation procedure, will be described later. In this section criteria are established on which to base the selection of strategies and the design of the task (an interview). First some definitions of communication strategies are explored which relate to what is being sought in the empirical part of the study. (It is important to point out that these definitions are restricted to productive and not receptive strategies.)

Although the first interest lies with the use of communication strategies by four particular subjects, it is hoped that they will serve as examples of advanced learner behaviour in general. By behaviour we mean linguistic rather than sociolinguistic behaviour. The prime focus is on how the subjects cope in communication, rather than on how they cope with the interview as a social interaction. Although the study is longitudinal, in that the subjects were recorded over a period of time on two separate occasions, we are not so much interested in their acquisition of grammatical rules as with their ability to cope with an insufficient linguistic knowledge on two separate occasions.

Faerch and Kasper (1983a, p.36) give a definition of communication strategies which focusses on psycholinguistic processes. They describe strategies as 'potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a communicative goal'. This definition sees communication from the learner's perspective. Tarone, on the other hand, includes the presence of the other interlocutor in her definition of communication strategies (1981, p.288). She speaks of 'a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures are not shared'.

As stated before, the main interest here is a psycholinguistic rather than a sociolinguistic one. However, it is assumed that in the oral interview task the interviewer will influence strategy choice. Indeed, the interview was so set up that the subjects had to recall a lexical item or find a suitable alternative. As Faerch (1984, p.58) points out, 'both the learner's and his or her interlocutor's performance constitute the relevant data'. Therefore the ability of the learner to cope with the discourse itself, and to keep the channel of communication going must be taken into account.

Canale and Swain's definition of strategic competence embraces a psycholinguistic and a sociolinguistic dimension. As was seen earlier, strategic competence is dependent on a learner's grammatical and sociolinguistic/discourse competence. In their definition of communication strategies (1980, p.30) they give as examples instances of strategy use which are both knowledge-based and control-based, similar to Bialystok and Sharwood Smith's distinction (1985). According to Canale and Swain (1980, p.30) strategies may be used 'to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence'. They cite as an example of performance variables the inability to recall what one really 'knows'. In other words, in the heat of the moment a learner sometimes cannot recall a usually familiar item. This is one example of when communication can break down. At other times, communication is disrupted because the learner has not mastered a rule, for example, and therefore cannot use it. Only the use of introspective data can reveal what kind of problem the learner faces - and then not always, as the data here shows.

As this investigation included a study of cognitive strategies in the mind of the subjects and interactional strategies which were used as a result of the communi-

cative oral task, criteria had to be set which were common to both kinds of processes. According to Faerch and Kasper (1983a, p.31) there are two criteria commonly used to identify both cognitive and interactional strategies. These criteria are problematicity and consciousness.

According to Bialystok (1984, p.39) problematicity 'refers to the notion that strategies are adopted when problems in either learning or production are perceived'. In other words the kind of communication strategies which are under discussion here are only needed when the speaker experiences a problem. They are therefore different from the plans which a speaker (whether of L1 or L2) makes in order to reach a communicative goal. (It is somewhat confusing that in Faerch and Kasper's definition of communication strategies—1983a, cited above—strategies are referred to as a plan.) Of course, L1 speakers experience problems in L1 production; for example, they momentarily forget words which are on the tip of the tongue. Bialystok (1984, p.46) describes how L1 speakers need to use knowledge-based strategies in the selection of precise words for maximum effect. In L2 production problems will be more frequent, because of the pressure of real-time language processing, but more from lack of linguistic knowledge.

Faerch and Kasper (1983a, pp.34-35) say that problems occur either at the planning phase of a communicative goal or at the phase of its execution. Seliger (1980) suggests that L2 learners can be categorised into two types: planners, who plan carefully before they talk (as evidenced by frequent filled or unfilled pauses) and correctors, who use a lot of repeats and repairs. According to Faerch and Kasper (1983a, p.34) problems that occur at the planning stage do so either because of insufficient linguistic knowledge (that means lexical knowledge as well) or because the speaker predicts problems in the execution of a plan.

The other stage where problems seem to occur is the 'execution phase' (Faerch and Kasper 1983a, p.34). Here the speaker has problems in retrieving items or rules which are contained in the plan. This is when the learner must exercise control in information accessing, but fails to do so. At this stage, the learner cannot use avoidance strategies in the sense of alternatives; on the other hand he may give up during the execution entirely, which is a kind of avoidance. In our taxonomy, a distinction is made between avoidance in the sense of topic avoidance, and avoidance of an item which results in an alternative, usually a paraphrase, being used. This is a somewhat artificial distinction, and is an example of the difficulties which were met when trying to classify the subjects' solutions to a communication problem.

To turn next to the notion of learner consciousness, the second criterion which has been used to define communication strategies. If we assume that strategies are used when the learner experiences a problem, then it follows that the learner will be more or less conscious of the way the problem is resolved. However, that is very simplistically and crudely put. We need to ask whether the use of strategies is to be linked in this investigation to problematicity or to wider cognitive processes in

language use and production.

There is evidence of disagreement among researchers over the degree to which communication strategies can be classified as conscious. Thus, for example, Tarone (1977) limits her investigation of communication strategies to those which are consciously employed, whereas later (1981, p.287) she prefers 'to avoid specifying degree of consciousness in any definition'. Sharwood Smith (1979, p. 69) points out that in any case individuals vary in the degree of awareness of their 'internal mental operations'. One learner might then be more aware of a problem and its resolution than another, and this awareness could, it can be argued, be linked to a wider metalinguistic awareness. Odlin (1986) links explicit knowledge (knowing about a language) to the communicative process. He says (p.132): 'The most universal explicit knowledge is that which makes the most important contributions to communicative competence'. In other words a learner's metalinguistic awareness (which learners possess in differing amounts) is an important factor in communicative competence. A link between the use of communication strategies and metalinguistic awareness must not be ignored here. Bialystok (1984, p.45) links the use of strategies to a learner's analysed (explicit) knowledge (defined more fully in Bialystok 1981) and to another cognitive process, that of cognitive control. Cognitive control, as we have seen, is the learner's ability to access information and use it procedurally. This process is, however, part of general cognitive language processing, and therefore impossible to identify empirically - at least in those utterances where the learner shows no evidence of problematicity. As Aitchison (1983, p.233) points out, language in a broken-down state is more revealing than when it is working perfectly.

It would therefore seem judicious here to link our categorisation of communication strategies with the criterion of problematicity. At the same time, any evidence of wider cognitive awareness and control which appears in the data can be used to build up a general picture of each learner's overall strategic competence. Although we are primarily concerned with psycholinguistically based strategies, discourse based strategies which are used to cope with problems arising from the two-way interaction between two people (such as requests for help) will also be included. Unfortunately the data was audio and not video recorded, therefore mime and gesture remained unidentified, unless a subject reported in the introspection that she had used them. However, the recordings were such that other performance features such as pauses, silent or filled, could be used to give audio clues to when the subjects experienced problems. The role of performance features as strategy markers is discussed next.

1.6 Performance features as strategy markers

It was pointed out earlier, in the discussion of discourse competence, that performance data such as filled pauses may be part of normal discourse behaviour. Usually the listener is unaware of the speaker's use of non-language-specific noises

and disregards filled pauses as irrelevant to the overall content of the message (Seliger 1980, p.32). Hesitation phenomena are part of natural L1 speech and do not necessarily imply that the speaker is experiencing problems in recall or lack of knowledge. Brown and Yule (1983, p.18) describe a typical L1 utterance thus: 'The speaker planning in the here-and-now, possibly threatened with his interlocutor wanting to take a turn, typically repeats himself a good deal [...] using the first word that comes to mind rather than hunting for the *mot juste*, filling in pauses with "fillers".' This being so, it would seem that the use of markers such as pauses to identify L2 production and communication problems and therefore strategies would be difficult and unreliable. Nevertheless, second language researchers have been able to use performance features in interlanguage studies.

Raupach (1983, 1987) and Dechert (1983) analyse the speech performance of advanced learners, using temporal variables. They base their analyses on the work of Goldman-Eisler and transfer her findings in the L1 experience to an L2 situation, assuming that the same approach 'can be extremely valuable if it is applied to foreign language performance' (Raupach 1987, p.133). These studies are of relevance here in that they are concerned with advanced language performance and are longitudinal. Raupach shows that measurements of speech units and temporal variables give insight into the learners' syntactic processing. In a similar study, Towell (1987) uses temporal variables to find out 'what it is that the student is doing to enable him to process language faster' (p.174). In a study of the use of communication strategies, Raupach (1983) uses hesitation phenomena as indicators of problematicity and the use of strategies. The presence of problems (as opposed to normal hesitancy) is shown if a learner makes 'excessive use' of temporal variables such as 'extremely long pauses' (p.203). In our study a similar approach was taken, as will be seen later. In the Stage Two introspection it was the subjects themselves who indicated when they had experienced problems. The tape-recording of their L2 interview was played back and usually they were able to stop the tape and explain what the problem had been. In the Stage One introspection, however, instances of problematicity were identified without the subjects' help, on the basis of the length and position of hesitation phenomena.

Using hesitation phenomena as strategy markers is not easy. Faerch and Kasper (1983b, p.220) point out that long pauses or drawls do not always indicate the presence of problems. They cite a study made by Raupach (1980) which shows that the length of pause or drawl may be influenced by the use of the same features in the learners' L1 - for example, French learners often transferred their tendency to drawl in French to the L2 situation. For this reason Raupach (1980) argues for a comparison between a learner's hesitation style in L2 with his L1 performance. For the sake of brevity such a comparison was not practical here. This was unfortunate, since in some parts of the subjects' speech flow it was a matter of speculation whether the hesitation phenomena were part of the subjects' natural speech style (i.e. their language behaviour which was the way they chose to express themselves)

or whether the hesitations indicated purely linguistic problems. It will be seen that the introspective data did not give the whole picture of subject behaviour. On the contrary, with one subject, it almost failed as a method. The methodology chosen was not by any means watertight. At the same time, the use of hesitation phenomena as problem indicators proved fairly reliable. The task was set up carefully, with external constraints as well as the internal constraints of the subjects in mind. The following section outlines the methodology.

2 DATA ELICITATION

2.1 Outline of methodology

This section first describes the methodology used to collect data from each of the four subjects and outlines different approaches to the study of communication strategies which have been used in past research. Then the task of oral interview is discussed in terms of what kind of speech data can be expected to result from the use of such a task. Finally the role of introspection data in a study of strategic competence is discussed.

As was outlined earlier, the data was collected at two stages, which were called Stage One and Stage Two. At Stage One each subject was interviewed in the target language by the subjects' teacher - a bilingual who will be referred to as the tester. The interview was tape-recorded and transcribed. It was fairly formal in format and register, and the questions asked of each subject were of a general nature; for example, about their secretarial course and past schooling. Immediately after the interview I recorded an L1 interview with each subject. The subject was asked about her skills at coping in an L2 performance and about the problems she experienced in the interview, as she perceived them. From these two recordings a linguistic profile was compiled of each subject, which will be described in section 3. The profile gives an account of the L2 communicative style of the subject and is a description of what kind of linguistic problems each subject faced and how she overcame them. The profile of each subject's performance at Stage One is given in section 3. Transcriptions of each L2 interview and the introspective reports are given in the Appendix.

At Stage Two, two more recordings were made, six months later. The subjects meanwhile had spent the time working as au pairs in France and Belgium. They were interviewed in L2 by the same tester. The interview included general questions about their experiences in France, but also focussed specifically on topics with specialised vocabulary. The subjects had, for example, to describe in detail how to operate an electric mixer. Lack of lexical knowledge had to be compensated for by the use of compensatory strategies. The subjects' use of communication strategies and other performance features were described in further profiles of their coping styles, given in section 4. This time the introspective data was collected in a different way. Each subject heard the tape of the L2 interview immediately after

it took place, and she was asked to stop the tape each time she recalled that she had experienced a problem. I took down verbatim how she described her linguistic problem, and later tried to classify the method she used to overcome the problem. These introspective remarks, together with my identification of how the problems were overcome, are incorporated in the text of section 4. Any changes in each subject's use of communication strategies from the first to the second stage were noted.

2.2 Approaches to data collection: the oral interview

The chief purpose of the L2 interviews was to elicit communication strategies used by the subjects.The interview task was chosen because interview procedures were part of the subjects' learning programme. They were accustomed to being tape-recorded and they entered into the experiment without inhibition. It was hoped that they would not feel tested in a way outside their normal experience at the college. The idea was that they should produce as natural a performance as possible in that particular context.

For myself the task of data analysis was more difficult. Any study of interlanguage is notoriously problematic. As Ellis (1985, p.188) puts it, identifying learner strategies at work 'is rather like stumbling blindfold around a room to find a hidden object'. We have already defined our 'hidden object' as communication strategies used to overcome linguistic problems. The task had to be difficult enough for the subjects to experience linguistic problems. At the same time the task was not a test - for one thing the fact that there were only two speech performances excluded any kind of criterion of reliability.

The task then had to be linguistically demanding without being seen by the subjects as some kind of test. It was expected that their linguistic competence would develop and improve during a six-month period in France or Belgium, therefore the second interview could be set up to be more demanding. The way the tester managed the discourse could achieve this effect. It seemed that the more control he exercised during the discourse, the more the subjects would be forced into a tight linguistic corner.

In past research the degree of control which the experimenter exercises in a task designed to elicit communication strategies has been varied. Faerch (1984, pp.59-60) describes two approaches to the setting up of such a task. One approach is what he calls 'the empirical trap'. The analyst preselects certain lexical items which the subject cannot avoid in order to carry out the task's instructions. An example of such a task is the picture reconstruction task set by Bialystok (1983). She states (p.103) that one criterion of the task was 'to have control over the items for which the communication strategies were to be examined'. She was relying on the fact that the subjects did not know (or would not recall) the correct lexis; therefore the items included non-core words like *tabouret* and *pelle*. In this approach tester control is the factor which could make the experiment succeed or not.

In the other approach to task design described by Faerch (1984) the analyst uses much less control in both the administration and the outcome of the experiment. In this approach there are no predetermined traps. Instead the subjects are encouraged to communicate 'in as natural a situation as possible' (p.60). The analyst then scans the performance data for evidence of the use of problem-based strategies. An example of this looser kind of experiment is that of Haastrup and Phillipson (1983). The discourse mode chosen is something between a conversation and an interview. The idea is to elicit as natural speech as possible from the subjects, given the context in which a video recorder is used. A profile is built up of each subject's communicative style, and communication strategies are evaluated in terms of achievement strategies. (These will be referred to in more detail later.) The strategies are identified by what Haastrup and Phillipson call 'communication disruptions' (p.143). Disruptions stem from mutual miscomprehension or 'when the learner is manifestly in trouble in putting across what he/she wants to say' (p.143). The latter communication disruption is identified by hesitation or non-verbal signals. The Stage One interview was to a large extent modelled on that of Haastrup and Phillipson (1983). It will now be discussed in terms of the problems that were met by both subjects and myself.

2.3 The interview task at Stage One

In the L2 interview given to the subjects at Stage One there were no preselected 'empirical traps'. Although the tester had earlier decided to use a few stock questions as a framework, he was to take a flexible approach to the direction in which the interview might proceed. In other words there was an opportunity for the subjects to exercise a certain amount of autonomy in the way they chose to respond to the questions. At the same time it could not be said that the atmosphere was relaxed enough to promote natural conversation of the kind described in the experiment of Haarstrup and Phillipson (1983). This was partly a consequence of the given relationship between the interlocutors in the experiment here; although empathy undoubtedly existed between tester and subjects, the fact remains that it was a pupil/teacher relationship. The semi-formal mode of discourse which took place has implications for the kind of output produced by the subjects, as we shall see.

First though there is the question of task difficulty and its effect on the subjects' linguistic output. On the face of it the interview was so loosely structured that there were no non-linguistic problems to be grappled with and no preselected items of lexical difficulty which could not be avoided. Nevertheless, the performance of all the subjects was hesitant and slow. There is evidence in past research that learners find the task of oral interview difficult for two reasons. One has to do with the general nature of the topics to be discussed, and the second has to do with the state of the learners' interlanguage.

To take the loose format of a general interview in which the topics discussed

were not centred around a here-and-now situation like the picture reconstruction task used by Tarone (1977); questions concerning the subjects' opinions of, for example, their schooling were focussed on what Ellis (1985, p.141) called a 'displaced activity'. Ellis cites a study by Hatch (1978) which illustrates that when a conversation (typically between adults) involves describing displaced activities, both L2 learner and native speaker alike experience problems in establishing the exact field of reference. Hatch (1978, p.414) finds that the speaker uses repairs as a strategy for communicating with the interlocutor, either as a request for clarification or as a time-holding device. The use of time-holding devices will be considered later on in the discussion of our taxonomy of strategies.

The topic of L2 learners talking about displaced activities in the target language is considered elsewhere by Ellis (1982). He takes the view (p.209) that 'the learner initially derives his IL system from a strategy of simplification'. However, according to Ellis (p.220), 'the strategy of semantic simplification relates to contiguous activity; it cannot cope adequately with displaced events'. This being so, it is not surprising that the oral interview given at Stage One presented its peculiar problems to the subjects. The content and the way it was presented was potentially problematic.

However, the fact remains that the oral interview was cognitively undemanding. The flexible approach of the tester left the subjects free to choose lexical items and syntactic constructions. Bialystok (1982, p.191) describes the learners' linguistic freedom inherent in such a task. She says: 'The Oral Communication Task biases the subject towards focussing on understanding the meaning of the situation [...] while it leaves several options for the linguistic representation of that meaning'. Yet, it had been earlier observed that these subjects produced often painfully erratic speech which did not seem to represent their linguistic knowledge.

The difficulty of matching procedural and declarative knowledge was described in section 1. In his study of advanced learners Raupach (1987, p.137) finds that in the 'cognitively undemanding task' of oral interview the subjects produce speech which is 'extremely hesitant and slow'. According to Raupach, his subjects have not yet learnt to used their declarative knowledge procedurally. He finds that the use of long pauses indicates that the subjects need time to apply a rule consciously. Their interlanguage is not sufficiently advanced to use rules and phrases automatically. In a similar study of advanced learners Towell (1987, p.17) gives a picture of 'the stumbling efforts of the first year student with a very low speaking rate, a very low phonation/time ratio, a large number of pause/filler/pause structures'. Towell suggests that his subjects' hesitancy is evidence that they have not yet learnt to create utterances unconsciously. They need time and attention to apply their declarative knowledge.

In this Stage One interview the tester had been briefed to allow each subject enough time to communicate her intended message, even though that might mean lengthy pauses and frequent restructuring. It had been observed in the classroom

that the subjects were far from fluent; it could be said that they had not yet acquired enough automatised rules and phrases to keep them going through difficulties of planning and recall. Dechert (1984, p.223) calls these automatised phrases 'islands of reliability'. He says (p.223): 'The more fluent, the more competent a speaker is, the larger is his island repertoire'. (It will be seen that these 'islands' can themselves become a communication strategy; the more advanced fluency displayed in the second stage interview by one subject in particular relied on the same 'islands' to overcome linguistic problems of all kinds.) However, at Stage One, very few automatised fillers had been acquired. It was up to the tester to encourage the subjects to not only try out linguistic hypotheses but to use alternative strategies if the message still did not come across as intended. McLaughlin (1987, p.139) describes the tester's role thus: 'When skills are not completely automatic [...] performance can be improved by giving the learner more time to apply controlled processes. Thus learners in test situations do better when given more time.'

Up to now we have been focussing on the role of the tester in this interview. We have concluded that if he allowed the subjects enough time to say what they wanted to say then all kinds of problem-solving strategies would be used to maximize the time and opportunity given to each subject. However, studies have shown that the more formal a task is, the more careful is the speech produced by subjects. Labov (1970) found that when a speaker is systematically observed, he or she pays more attention to speech. He calls this the 'observer's paradox' (p.47). Tarone (1983, p.152) describes an interlanguage continuum — the more formal the speech style, the more attention the learner pays to speech production. This attention can either focus on grammatical form and its correctness or on the content of the intended message.

Whether the subjects in this study resorted to strategies as problem-solving devices because they wanted to produce the correct grammatical form or because they had difficulty getting their intended message across, regardless of error, is not the main issue. It is the solution that the subjects found to a problem that is of relevance, not the trouble source. If we follow Labov's finding that subjects who know that they are being observed (and recorded) are likely to pay attention to what they say, it follows that they might try all the more to solve problems of communication breakdown. In fact, all four subjects tried hard to keep the communication channel open.

Clearly the concept of learner attention is not the same as learner control. It was seen in section 1 that the ability to monitor speech and retrieve declarative knowledge is a partially conscious process. Nevertheless it seems reasonable to investigate a link between attention in language performance and the use of certain communication strategies. Of course, not all communication strategies used consciously by the learner are visible to the analyst. Faerch and Kasper (1983b, p.235) point out that advanced learners in particular use 'covert' strategies like avoidance to good effect; the more fluent they become, the less obvious some

strategies become. Raupach (1983, p.199) points out that 'successful' strategies usually pass unnoticed, whereas pronounced hesitations show up learners' efforts to overcome problems.

It had been assumed that in the Stage One interview the subjects would not be fluent enough to use a whole series of successful strategies such as topic avoidance or fast change of linguistic plan. It was hoped that the formal (but friendly) atmosphere of the interview would elicit a variety of problem-solving strategies. It was further hoped that, if the subjects were given enough time to express what they wanted to say, they would feel encouraged to improve their communicative performance by restructuring and repair. The lack of tester control and pressure meant that they did not feel embarrassed to use lengthy pauses and drawls. These marked and frequent hesitation phenomena could then be used as communication strategy markers.

2.4 The interview task at Stage Two

Nearly seven months after the first L2 interview was administered to each subject, the same tester interviewed each subject in a similarly semi-formal manner. It was assumed that because the subjects had been living in France or Belgium for six months, away from a formal learning situation and in an entirely French-speaking environment, there would be some degree of noticeable improvement in fluency and possibly grammatical accuracy. It is interesting to note that in a longitudinal study of L2 learners who have spent one term in the target language country Raupach (1983, p.207) finds the following: 'Whereas the interviews following the stay abroad showed no appreciable progress in the learners' command of grammatic structures, there was a considerable change in the use of communication strategies'. Time and space do not allow a study of grammatical change in the subjects' performance in this study. It must be said that this tester assumed that the subjects would have progressed in fluency enough for him to be able to give a linguistically more demanding interview than at Stage One.

Unlike the empirical studies of Bialystok (1983), Tarone (1977), Varadi (1980) and Dechert (1983), the preselected items were not set in the here-and-now of the interview context. In all the studies mentioned above the subjects were analysed on the basis of descriptions of a series of pictures. In this study the second interview was set up with two things in mind. The first purpose was to replicate the general question/response format of the Stage One interview (which lasted about 12 minutes in all). The tester chose an action which the subject had to describe in a factual, plausible way. It was estimated that the subject would then experience some difficulty in, for example, describing exactly how she had changed a baby's nappy. If the tester felt that the subject was avoiding the word for 'fastener' he kept up enough pressure so that the subject had to express the lexical item in another way. What the tester was doing resembled the attempt by Tarone (1977) 'to precipitate a crisis of communication in which the subjects were attempting to communicate

concepts for which they did not yet know (or were unsure of) the correct target language form' (p.196). Although the tester remained as courteous as before, there was one subject at least who 'knew' what he was trying to do by putting linguistic pressure on them. Subject 2 afterwards remarked that she thought the pressure was 'deliberate' and 'typical of Monsieur B' (the tester/teacher). Fortunately all the subjects were willing to co-operate most of the time and tried to give detailed descriptions of the action as well as they could. The fact that the tester was their language teacher may have contributed to the subjects' resourcefulness in finding communication strategies. Although they had been told that the interview was not a test, it could be that they felt tested at this stage of the interview. This factor could lead to achievement type rather than reduction type strategies.

2.5 The use of introspection

The first section of this chapter described briefly how two different methods were used to elicit introspective data from each subject immediately after each L2 interview. After the Stage One interview each subject was asked by the experimenter to describe in fairly general terms how she thought she performed when speaking the target language and to identify particular problems she experienced during that particular task as well as at other times, in class for example. (This conversation was tape-recorded and later transcribed.) After the Stage Two interview a more task-specific approach was taken, as we saw in the outline of methodology in 2.1. Now it was up to each subject to recall when she had experienced a linguistic problem and why. In section 4, which discusses this stage of the experiment and records all the instances where the subjects stopped the tape, we find that this method of data elicitation varied in success from subject to subject.

The differences, both theoretical and practical, between these two methods will be discussed later in this section. First we need to justify the use of introspective data in this study, and to outline the role that such data can play in an investigation of strategic competence.

Purely on an intuitive basis it seemed reasonable, in a study of learners' ability to cope during oral performance, to ask the subjects themselves what was going on in their minds during that performance. However, such a notion was too simplistic for two reasons. First there is the question of learner response. We do not know to what extent the response of the subjects can be reliable enough for the experimenter to draw firm conclusions, and there is the added difficulty that a subject might not be able to describe adequately what happened. A second, more fundamental question is the difficulty of using conscious introspective thought in a study of partly conscious, partly automatic speech utterances.

To take the first question, the notion of the reliability of learners' verbal reports, doubts have been expressed over the subject. For example, Seliger (1983, p.183) makes a distinction between introspection and intuition, saying that they are not the same thing. He says (p.183): 'Introspections are conscious verbalisations of *what*

we think we know. Intuition, on the other hand, is something we have but cannot describe.' Later (p.188) he refers to the possibility of a learner 'post hoc guessing' in a verbal report on a given task.

However, Cohen (1984) criticizes Seliger's scepticism over the reliability of learners' introspective data. In a defence of using verbal report data he cites (p.107) empirical studies described by Ericsson and Simon (1980) which demonstrate the usefulness and reliability of learners' verbal reports. Cohen says (p.106) that 'patterns emerge which begin to take on a certain reality as they are corroborated by more learners'. In other words, as more studies use introspective data, the more it becomes apparent that learner intuitions are correct. For example, in a study of the degree of insight learners have into their own learning problems, Tran-Thi-Chau (1975) finds that learners were able to predict accurately their problem areas (p.137).

If we accept that our subjects' introspection was reliable in that it identified accurately their own problem areas, we could not, however, assume that each subject would successfully describe those problems. Cohen and Robbins (1976, p.61) state: 'Learners may not have all the necessary metalanguage to describe their errors'. They refer to the use of introspection to gain insight into learners' grammatical difficulties based on error analysis. Similar scepticism has been expressed over learners' ability to express thoughts about their ability to perform well. For example, Selinker (1972, reprint, p.51) questions whether what he calls 'perceptual interlingual studies' can be 'testable' in performance situations. Odlin (1986, p.124) uses a broader notion of language in general use as a basis for describing the lack of general metalinguistic awareness in some learners. He says: 'Some individuals speak a language well yet show little awareness of how they actually use the language'. It so happened that in this study Subject 3 showed so little metalinguistic awareness that she could not find the language to describe her problems at Stage One or Stage Two. On the other hand, the other subjects showed an innate ability to describe their linguistic problems for the first time, as the following chapters will show.

To take next the second question which was raised earlier, namely the use of introspective data to describe learner language which, as we have already seen, can be partly an automatic, unconscious process. We saw that this question is addressed by Faerch and Kasper (1987). In a discussion of procedural knowledge they point out that most of the processes involved in its use are activated automatically (p.12). It follows, according to the authors, that these automatic processes do not enter short-term memory and therefore are 'not accessible for introspective report'. However, in those instances in which learners experience problems in language processing and production, the use of automatic speech has clearly broken down. (As we hear on the tape recordings, the subjects' experience of problems was evidenced by the use of prolonged pauses and drawls.) Faerch and Kasper make a tentative link between learners' introspective reports on their problems and the

use of communication strategies. They say (p.12): 'Sudden breakdowns of automatic processing, such as when the learner is faced with a problem in reception of production due to a lack of relevant (declarative) linguistic or other knowledge, often initiate attended processing, e.g. the use of communication strategies. These attended processes are then available to introspective reports'.

We have already seen that the more advanced the learner becomes in proficiency, the more likely he will be to learn to anticipate problems and either avoid a topic or the use of a grammatical rule or lexical item. In such cases only the use of introspective data may reveal the adoption of alternative communication strategies. When a learner becomes skilled in using covert strategies (Faerch and Kasper, 1983b, p.235) strategy markers such as hesitation phenomena cease to be reliable markers of compensatory strategies. (In section 4 it will be shown that at the Stage Two interview one subject in particular was very proficient in avoidance strategies; only her introspective data revealed this.)

It was hoped that the introspective reports would considerably help the analysis of the L2 data. Two slightly different methods of collecting the introspective data were used, on the assumption that both methods would be productive and reliable.

Poulisse, Bongaerts and Kellerman (1987) point out that the use of introspective data in a study must follow certain guidelines if the data is going to be reliable. They cite (p.217) Ericsson and Simon's (1984) list of conditions under which introspection can be reliably used. These include the following factors, which both sets of introspective data in our study on the whole met: (i) the data must be collected immediately after the task; (ii) subjects should be given 'contextual clues' (in the Stage One introspection conversation, the subjects were *not* given a clue, in that the tape was not played back); (iii) the subjects were not told before the L2 task that they would be asked to introspect.

The main difference between the two methods used at each stage to collect introspective data was this. The Stage One conversation was not specifically related to what Faerch and Kasper (1987, p.14) call a 'concrete action'. Although the subjects were asked to comment on any problems they had experienced in the interview, the conversation centred on what Faerch and Kasper (1987, p.14) call reports 'about general tendencies in their communication and learning behaviour'. The purpose at this stage was to see to what extent the subjects' awareness of their linguistic problems correlated with what was observed in the L2 data and to see to what extent they had developed the ability to describe their communicative problems. At the second stage, the introspective data was very much related to concrete action. The tape was played back to the subjects to jolt their memory. The method used followed that employed by Poulisse, Bongaerts and Kellerman (1987) — except that in their study video-recordings were used.

The Stage One method is an example of what Cohen (1987, p.84) calls 'self-report' - 'learners' description of what they do, characterized by generalized statements about learning behaviour'. On the other hand, the Stage Two data were

entirely self-observation. This, according to Cohen (p.84), is 'the inspection of specific language behaviour' (that is, related to a specific task or event). One subject, Subject 3, found both approaches equally hard to deal with. Therefore for her it was impossible to speculate on which method was more successful than the other. For the other three subjects the Stage Two introspection, although it did not give a complete picture of their strategic behaviour, seemed a more productive method to use.

2.6 The selection of communication strategies

Given the constraints of time and space, it was decided to evaluate only those communication strategies which had a reasonable chance of being identified with certainty. They had to be chosen according to the criterion that they were used in a compensatory way to overcome communication problems and disruptions. Even then, the analysis of the data was bound to be a difficult process.

For the reasons described above, it was decided not to include two major categories in our analysis: transfer from L1 and simplification (both lexical and grammatical). By L1 transfer is meant here 'negative transfer from the native language [...] resulting in utterances that are not just inappropriate but actually incorrect' (Tarone, Cohen and Dumas, 1976, p.77). Although Singleton (1987, pp.45-46) points out that transfer can be 'a resource expansion strategy in moments of communicative difficulty', it seemed impossible to isolate such instances in the data, given the time available and the difficulty of categorising L1 influenced utterances. For example, Subject 1, Stage One, used the word 'perfecter' (in the sense 'to perfect'). It could not be determined whether she was coining this utterance from her L1 knowledge system in a compensatory way. Reference is made to L1 influence in the speech of Subject 3 in particular, but only in a general context; it is not analysed quantitatively.

For similar reasons the category of simplification was ignored. It proved impossible to distinguish between lack of lexical knowledge and topic avoidance from the data. Only through introspection was it possible to make that distinction (and then not with all subjects). An example of lack of lexical knowledge is in the Stage Two interview where Subject 1 described how she had said she used the word 'couteau' because she did not know the word for potato peeler. Elsewhere, however, she reported that she had said 'j'étais tout seule dans la maison' because she could not be bothered to go into a more lengthy response. Those strategies which proved more possible to identify are described in the taxonomy in 2.8.

2.7 The selection of performance features

The role that hesitation phenomena can play in the analysis of communication strategies has already been described with reference to the work of Dechert (1983, 1984, 1986) and Raupach (1983, 1987). Raupach (1983) found that an increase of filled or unfilled pauses indicated a trouble-source in oral production. He cites

other studies which show that 'hesitation pauses tend to occur both at constituent and at lexical selection points' (pp.214f.). Poulisse, Bongaerts and Kellermann (1984, p.87) state: 'pauses and hesitations which fall in unnatural places or before "difficult" words are more indicative of Cps [=compensatory strategies] than those that occur at the end of grammatical units'. In our study this seemed to be the case also.

Of drawls (lengthened syllables) Raupach says: 'our hunch would be that drawls typically occur in function words in order for the speaker to gain time for the selection of the next lexical item'. An analysis of drawls was attempted at both stages. Interestingly, they were not used by any subject at Stage One.

Other performance features were included in the analysis of the data because they helped to describe in a more general way the overall coping style of each subject. One example was what Towell (1987) calls 'chunks'. These are frequently used, automatised structures. In a study of advanced learners, Towell found that the subjects used them in a compensatory way, to make up for inadequate resources (p.178). In another study of advanced learners, Wildner-Bassett (1986) is of the view that it is perfectly possible to identify lexicalized fillers, which she calls 'gambits' (p.162). She finds that gambits can be recognised as time-filling devices when they are used more extensively than would be normal in native speech, or when they are used inappropriately. This feature was included in the taxonomy to accommodate the speech style of Subject 2 in particular.

Another performance feature which was analysed was the use of self-correction of a grammatical item: a form of repair which Tarone (1980) rejects in her stricter definition of communication strategies. It could be argued that they are not made in order to compensate for lack of knowledge, but they were a valuable category in this study because they were evidence of the degree to which the subjects monitored their output.

The use of repeated words or phrases was included in the description of the subjects' ways of retrieving lexical items. Repetition was clearly used as a time-gaining device. Finally, it was regretted that the interviews had not been video-recorded so that visual ways of coping with problems could have been noted.

2.8 A taxonomy of communication strategies and other features

The recordings of the Stage One and Stage Two interviews were analysed using the following criteria (based on Faerch and Kasper, 1983, pp.52-53; and Ellis, 1983, pp.184-85). The examples are taken from the transcriptions of the four subjects' Stage One interviews, given in the Appendix.

COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

(i) Functional reduction strategies - the subject is heard to abandon her message.

Example: c'est un petit village (- -) uh c'est (- -) uh (laughs) (Subject 4, lines 53/54)

(ii) Achievement, compensatory strategies

Code-switching to L1 Example: il y a le uh (-) *day* (Subject 3, line 54)

Paraphrase - the subject is heard to replace an L2 item by describing or exemplifying it.
Example: les professeurs étaient très uh (-) différents à les (-) uh (-) à nous (= the students) (Subject 1, lines 14/15)

Word-coinage - the subject replaced an L2 item with a made up item.
Example: c'est très [ɑ̃mitei] (Subject 1, line 51)

Restructuring - the subject developed an alternative plan in mid grammatical unit.
Example: j'ai fait j'avais réussi (Subject 1 lines 12/13)

(iii) Retrieval strategies - the subject waited for the lexical item to come, without resorting to a compensatory strategy. Example: je travaille dans un pub uh (-) trois (- -) soirs (Subject 1, line 47)

(iv) Direct appeal - the subject asked the tester for assistance, because of a productive or receptive difficulty. Example: je ne comprends pas la question (Subject 2, line 33)

OTHER PERFORMANCE FEATURES

Self-corrections — the subject corrected a grammatical item.
Example: donc j'arriverai uh j'arrive uh j'ai arrivé (Subject 3, line 13)

Repetition — the subject repeated words or phrases to gain time for the selection or recall of the next lexical item.
Example: avec l'argent et à la à la (- -) caisse (Subject 2, line 61)

Pauses - the subject used filled or unfilled pauses, usually at a lexical selection point. Typically these pauses were used in conjunction with the filler *uh*.
Example: comment uh (- -) tous les choses (Subject 1, line 33)

Drawls (lengthened syllables) of non-lexicalized fillers
Example: on se lève euh: à sept heures et demie (Subject 2, lines 91/92 Stage Two interview)

Chunks or gambits
Example: tous les choses comme ça (Subject 2, line 18 Stage Two interview)

Notes on the transcription

Pauses which lasted less than one second are transcribed (-).

Pauses which lasted one second or more are transcribed (- -).

Non-lexicalized fillers which did not sound native-like were given the standard notation *uh*. Non-lexicalized fillers which were pronounced in a native-like way (e.g. by the tester) were given the notation *euh*.

Drawls, i.e. a lengthened syllable, when used in conjunction with non-lexicalized fillers, were transcribed thus: *euh:*.

The interlanguage of the subjects did not always lend itself to transcription. Only those words which could not be understood were phonetically transcribed. Otherwise subjective decisions had to be made in the orthography: for example, whether to add the agreement on *j'ai arrivé* or not.

3 FINDINGS: STAGE ONE

3.1 The selection of subjects

Section 2 described how the task of L2 interview was set up and suggested that the nature and format of the task might influence the subjects' linguistic behaviour in the performance of that task. This section starts by addressing the possibility that the personality type or cognitive style of the subject might play a part in the way the subject performs in L2. It was decided that this possibility could be tentatively explored if the four subjects chosen for the study had already been seen in class to possess different personality traits when they were speaking the target language. The traits that had been observed were on a continuum between the very shy and the very confident. It must be said that judgements about the subjects' personalities were based on a subjective, amateurish appraisal of how they were perceived to behave by their teachers in class, and on an informal question and answer session in class in which all the learners in the group had to describe their confidence level in L2 performance. The focus of this study is not on the relationship between different personality types and performance; the basic question is to what extent individual learners develop their own ways of coping in L2 oral performance. Nevertheless, it seemed sensible to select four subjects who seemed already to approach the L2 interview in different ways. At the start of the experiment it appeared that the disparity found in the coping styles which the four subjects used was due to the confidence factor. However, the analysis of the data, also the introspective reports, showed that this assumption was too simplistic. In this section the data collected at Stage One is analysed and individual methods of dealing with the L2 interview are described.

First a brief account is given of how the four Subjects were chosen for the study. We noted in the introduction that, on the face of it, the learner group from which

the subjects were chosen was fairly homogenous. The first criterion in the selection was to choose only subjects with whom the teacher/tester had already established some kind of rapport. He should not provoke any anxiety. Chastain (1975, p.160) concludes from an empirical study that there is a link between anxiety and the quality of learner output. The subjects and the tester had to relate to one another in an interactive way. The possible influence of the tester on learner output has already been discussed. Harding (1983, p.19) extends this notion by pointing to the extent to which an interlocutor's behaviour can influence the use of certain strategies and gives as an example the authoritative attitude or status of the interlocutor.

The second criterion for choosing four subjects from the group was based on the possibility that different personality types and cognitive types (as perceived in an entirely intuitive way) might play a role in the use of certain strategies, regardless of the behaviour of the interlocutor. There has been considerable discussion about individuals' different cognitive styles in learning and performing (Ellis 1985, p.11). Reference has already been made to Seliger's (1980) distinction between 'planners' and 'correctors'. Krashen (1981) refers to a 'Monitor overuser' and a 'Monitor underuser'. The former 'refers to his conscious grammar all the time' (p.15) and the latter, using his subconsciously acquired system, monitors 'by feel' (p.16). Corder (1978) posits that some learners are risk takers. The way learners instinctively use a language is, of course, part of their personality. When different cognitive styles are discussed as above, it is clear that they are related to typical learner behaviour. Learner behaviour is referred to as personality type. As Ellis (1985, p.123) points out, 'it is difficult to distinguish variables relating to cognitive style and personality'. Empirical studies have led to the hypothesis that innate personality characteristics influence strategic behaviour. For example Tarone (1977) found that the more 'adventurous' subjects used more achievement type strategies than avoidance strategies. However, without some kind of psychological test to apply to all the subjects in this study (clearly there was neither time nor space here to make such a test meaningful), it was difficult to identify which personality traits were relevant to the kind of output produced by each subject—particularly because at this stage they had not yet been in the situation where the terms field-dependent and field-independent could be applied; that is, they had not yet been in a community where the target language was spoken.

Without the possibility of applying a psychological test to each subject, there only remained an intuitive assumption (which is possibly made by all teachers of L2) that outgoing, outwardly confident subjects would behave differently in L2 from more shy, withdrawn subjects. It was assumed that confident subjects might use more risk-taking strategies. However, Littlewood (1983, p.204) points out that an individual alters his linguistic behaviour according to different contexts. Brown (1973) takes a similarly cautious approach to linking innate personality traits to communicative competence. He says (p.233): 'A person is forced to take on a new

identity if he is to become competent in a second language' and warns that introversion is not necessarily undesirable in the acquisition of competence.

Nevertheless, it was decided to use the introvert/extrovert yardstick as a starting-point for the selection of subjects. It did not seem sensible to choose four similar personalities in a study of the ways individuals cope orally. In the initial question-and-answer session in class, all the learners in the group were asked two questions: how confident they felt when using L2 in class, and how they thought they coped in overcoming their own linguistic problems.

In response, Subjects 1 and 2 said they felt confident when speaking French in class, Subjects 3 and 4 said they felt shy. Other teachers, including the French teacher (the tester), agreed that the subjects presented themselves in this way. The second question was asked to see to what extent each subject could identify her linguistic problems and verbalise the ways she overcame them. The question was put in order to see if introspection might be a reliable way of gaining insight into the subjects' oral performance. Only Subject 1 was able to give a detailed assessment of her linguistic problems and the ways she overcame them. (It is important to point out that none of the subjects had been exposed to a discussion of communication strategies.) The inability of the other subjects to comment on their ways of coping orally may have been due to lack of appropriate metalinguistic vocabulary. For example, all Subject 2 could say was: 'I get in a muddle and fumble through'.

In spite of three subjects' lack of introspective skills, it was decided to use introspective self-report after each interview. Using these reports together with the taped L2 interviews, a coping profile of each subject was made, following the performance profiles of learners made in the study by Haarstrup and Phillipson (1983).

Table 1 summarizes how the strategies and other performance features described in the taxonomy on pages 25f. above were used by each subject in the Stage One interview.

This table is useful in three ways. First, it shows that the four subjects did not vary significantly in the number of times they used those communication strategies under analysis. Although Subject 1 showed a definite tendency to restructure in the middle of a grammatical unit, other compensation strategies were used with approximately the same frequency by each subject.

Secondly, the table shows that at this stage the use of performance features did vary from one subject to another. For example, Subject 2 used repetition as a coping strategy frequently; Subject 4 hardly used it at all. Subject 3 made several self-corrections of a grammatical item, although her formal mastery of the target language was not less than the rest. She just tended to monitor more consciously than the others.

Thirdly, it emerges that the confidence factor (which was originally thought to play a possible role in the use of certain strategies) did not play an obvious role;

Table 1 Summary of the subjects' use of strategies at Stage One. (Figures refer to the number of times each strategy was used.)

Strategies	Subject 1	Subject 2	Subject 3	Subject 4
Message abandonment	2	0	0	1
Code-switching to L1	2	0	3	3
Paraphrase in L2	2	2	0	0
Word-coinage	2	0	1	0
Restructuring:an alternative plan	7	1	2	1
Retrieval: waiting to recall	2	2	3	6
Direct appeal to tester the tester	0	4	0	1
Grammatical self-correction	2	3	6	3
Repetition	9	11	8	3
Long pauses	very few	very few	few	frequent
Drawls	0	0	0	0
Gambits	0	0	0	0

as the table shows, Subjects 1 and 2, who were chosen for the study because of their apparent confidence in L2 performance, did not significantly go for more achievement-type strategies such as paraphrase or word-coinage; neither did the shyer Subjects 3 and 4 use more reduction strategies than the others.

The table, which is only skeletal in content, provides the starting-point for a more detailed assessment of each subject's coping style at Stage One.

3.2 Profile of the coping style of Subject 1 at Stage One

Each profile of the subjects' coping style at Stage One is built from three sources: first, their initial class written responses to the general questions concerning their coping ability as they perceived it in the French class; secondly, the transcriptions of the L2 interviews (reproduced in the Appendix, pp.58-71), and

thirdly their introspective reports recorded immediately after the interviews, the transcriptions of which are also in the Appendix, immediately following each interview.

In her response to the class questions about her confidence and general coping abilities, Subject 1 showed that she was optimistic about her ability to perform well orally in the target language. In practice, her confidence was well founded. In her class response she showed that she knew the kinds of problems she faced and how she overcame them. For want of a better term, this awareness will be referred to from now on as metalinguistic awareness. Subject 1 was able to articulate this awareness. She wrote: 'I have good conversational French. I wouldn't hesitate to speak it, I can keep going regardless of my grammatical mistakes. I think my big problem would be a silence, so I don't stop and think before I answer, that's the silence I hate. So I tend to talk a lot while I think.'

A glance at Table 1 shows that Subject 1 tended to use restructure and repetiton in the middle of grammatical units. An example of her stop-start style is in lines 12/13: 'j'ai fait j'avais réussi dans beaucoup de mes matières uh j'ai j'avais fait le certificat Intermediate (...)'. This kind of speech style gave the impression that she did indeed prefer to keep the flow going. Her dislike of silences was evident; she used very few pauses which lasted more than two seconds. The pauses were either at clause boundaries, or at lexical selection points, for example (lines 45/46): 'j'ai travaillé dans un agence de (- -) de voyages (...)'. In spite of her efforts to keep the flow going, Subject 1's general communicative style was rather halting. She was clearly experiencing frequent disruptions in the execution of her constituent plans. At this stage she had not yet acquired the use of enough automatised rules to make her output more fluent; her procedural knowledge was not developed. Her performance was not helped by the fact that she had not acquired native-like performance features to ease the halting style: for example, there were no instances of drawls, and the non-lexicalized fillers were variations of the L1 pronounced *uh* instead of the more native-like *euh*. Nor was there evidence of L2 lexicalised filled pauses or gambits. This is perhaps not surprising, since Subject 1, like the other subjects, had not yet been in a country where the target language is spoken—although clearly their teacher (the tester) exposed them to L2 fillers in his discourse, as the transcriptions show.

To turn to the strategies Subject 1 used: apart from restructuring and repeating, there were numerically few instances of all the other categories in the taxonomy. As was mentioned earlier, Subject 1, who had been expected possibly to use some adventurous, achievement-type strategies (because of her generally confident attitude) used very few. There were two cases of message abandonment (lines 52 and 80) and two cases of paraphrase (lines 24 and 16). It had been hoped, mistakenly, that Subject 1 would use the L2 knowledge she had to find approximations to lexical items she did not know. In spite of her normally outgoing nature in class, Subject 1 made no direct appeals to the tester. When on one occasion she

clearly was in difficulty in forming a response, she preferred to simplify her response (unusually, since she tended to be expansive in her responses) after a long, four-second pause. She was asked where she got off the bus at Rathmines, and instead of asking for clarification she replied: 'Uh à Rathmines' (line 26).

In her introspective report, made immediately after the L2 interview, Subject 1 again showed that she had an accurate mental representation of her linguistic problems and their solutions. For example, she had this to say on her ways for coping with lexical search and recall (Introspection, lines 12/14): 'you'd find a way round saying it' [i.e. restructure, paraphrase], 'you'd say something that just doesn't make sense' [i.e. word coinage?], and 'sometimes you just keep going' [through restructure and repeat?].

Subject 1 was less articulate in her metalanguage concerning her use of grammar. She seemed to take grammar to mean verbs (line 51). There was evidence that verbs did bother her. For example, she clearly self-corrected in lines 76/77, even using an L1-pronounced *no* as she corrected: 'nous partagez *no* partageons'. Although she was intent on keeping going, she did occasionally show that she was monitoring at the same time.

To sum up: already Subject 1 showed tendencies which were to appear more pronounced after she returned from France. She seemed to prefer to restructure, that is, change her mind in the middle of a grammatical unit and rephrase rather than slow down and wait for the original item to come to her or test a rule cautiously. Secondly, she showed that her introspective remarks were accurately realised in her performance; she seemed to have a strong metalinguistic awareness of her interlanguage problems and the strategies she used to cope.

3.3 Profile of the coping style of Subject 2 at Stage One

Like Subject 1, Subject 2 was perceived by her teachers and by herself to behave confidently when speaking L1 or the target language. To the initial class question on confidence she wrote: 'My confidence is fine'. However, she admitted to nervousness if she made mistakes when speaking L2. She could not express what her problems were or how she coped, however.

The general characteristics of Subject 2's performance in the interview were as follows. Her speech output was fast and apparently flowing; there were very few long pauses in the middle of grammatical units. Subject 2 gave the impression that she could cope with any linguistic problems (and there were many) because she produced a stream of utterances with apparent ease. A closer analysis revealed that she achieved this effect through the use of the filler *uh* and repetition.

Unlike her L1 speech, her L2 production relied heavily on the time-gaining filler *uh*: for example in line 13 'uh je prends uh l'autobus uh (-)'. Subject 2 made use of this feature in such a way that it came across as part of her natural L2 speech, even though it was not essentially a native-like utterance. (Her introspective comments showed that she was aware of the importance of *uh* in her communica-

tion. She said (line 15): 'I go Uh' in the face of lexical difficulty.)

Subject 2 used repetition in order to gain time when trying to recall a lexical item or in order to cope with complex syntactic structures such as verbs in the perfect tense: for example, 'je ne je ne suis pas préparé' (lines 79f.).

Subject 2 was unadventurous in her use of communication strategies. In spite of reporting: 'the vocabulary well in most cases I'd be able to get around that' (lines 48f.), she used paraphrase only twice. When asked whether she preferred to take a risk and say the wrong word or preferred not to say it, she opted for the latter (lines 24ff.). This approach is evidenced in the fact that she did not use any code-switching or word-coinage. The tendency was to use a limited vocabulary of which she was sure; as she introspected: 'I just used the same verb like *aller* that's something I'm used to doing' (lines 6f.).

Subject 2's cautious approach, however, did not mean that she preferred to give up her message; there were no instances of message abandonment, and, as was stated above, she rarely changed plan in the middle of a grammatical unit.

To sum up: Subject 2's main tendency at this stage was to use repetition as a method for filling in a potential silence caused by unstable and often unsound grammatical and lexical knowledge. She did not hesitate to appeal to the tester when faced with receptive problems, which she did four times. In her introspection after the interview, she showed that she had some idea of what kinds of problems she experienced, and that she was aware of the nature of her general communicative style. However, she was less aware of how she overcame these problems, and was even less able to articulate any strategies used, apart from the use of *uh*. Subject 2 at this stage was very expansive in her responses, as seen in the long stretches in the data. This expansiveness, together with frequent repetition, was even more marked at Stage Two.

3.4 Profile of the coping style of Subject 3 at Stage One

Unlike Subjects 1 and 2, Subject 3 was generally perceived as shy when having to perform orally, particularly in French class. As she initially said: 'I am afraid of making a fool of myself in French'. Subject 3 did indeed come across as nervous, and possibly used throat-clearing as a time-gaining filler (for example, line 11). However, the distribution of her use of communication strategies was not significantly different from those used by Subjects 1 and 2. She did not use any more reduction strategies, for example. On the contrary, Subject 3 showed a relentless determination to keep going. As she said in the introspection afterwards, she had been encouraged to do so at school (for the Leaving Certificate), but added: 'I tell myself as well' (line 53).

Subject 3 was clearly hampered in her communication by a lack of knowledge of grammatical rules. She seemed to be aware of this problem because of the sometimes painful efforts to put things right. It was at times difficult to determine whether an utterance was restructure, a self-correction of a grammatical rule, or a

case of the speaker testing a hypothesis about tense. Lines 13f. are an example of the 'think aloud' technique of this subject: 'et uh uh donc j'arriverai uh j'arrive uh j'ai arrivé au Rathmines'. This tendency to solve linguistic problems while thinking aloud was the hallmark of her performance.

One feature of Subject 3's performance which was unexpected in the speech of a fairly advanced learner was the sudden use of *because* (line 67); unexpected because she had frequently used 'parce que'. In another instance of code-switching (line 54) she was trying to recall the L2 lexical item and was clearly aware of her strategy: 'il y a le uh (-) *day* (laughs)'.

Subject 3 avoided long pauses—there were only two long pauses used to recall a lexical item. She gained planning or recall time by repetition, for example 'c'est uh c'est uh mais uh c'est' (line 56), or by using at times inappropriate organisers, for example 'et donc et puis' (line 12). There was no use of drawls.

In the introspection made after the interview, Subject 3 showed signs that she did not respond well to this procedure. The conversation with her was difficult for three reasons. First, Subject 3 did not seem to be aware of having experienced any linguistic problems, even though there had been frequent communication disruptions and her output had at times been painfully produced. In her introspection, Subject 3 said (line 12): 'Well I was fine there I thought'. It seemed unlikely that she was deliberately concealing her true reaction to her performance.

The second difficulty in asking Subject 3 to introspect was that, when pushed to define her problem areas, she insisted that her problems lay with verbs and not nouns (line 15), and in particular with the correct tense (line 37). She reported having difficulty with the conditional and imperfect tenses (lines 41f.), but thought the present and past 'fine'—a comment not borne out in the data. This confusion in Subject 3's mind leads to another difficulty of using introspection with her. Either she had no recollection of her performance, or she was not aware of the problem sources, or, thirdly, she did not possess the appropriate metalanguage to describe her performance. It seems that all these factors played a role in Subject 3's introspective report. Already at this stage it was clear that her metalinguistic awareness was very limited. Significant for this study is that at Stage Two, Subject 3 displayed an even more marked inability to introspect on her performance. Possible reasons for this will be explored in section 5.

3.5 Profile of the coping style of Subject 4 at Stage One

Like Subject 3, Subject 4 was generally felt to be a reticent student who rarely volunteered to speak in class. She wrote in the initial question and answer session: 'I get nervous and the French gets all mixed up. I'm quiet in class, I don't mind putting the French together but I would have to be almost sure the French was correct, because if I had to rephrase it I would get really mixed up. I tend to get tongue-tied.'

From these remarks it was not surprising that Subject 4 was the least forthcom-

ing of the four. She was quite content to give one- or two-word responses (for example, lines 21 and 35), with the effect that the tester reported that she had been hard work to interview. This taciturnity, stemming from a desire to utter only what she was sure was correct, may have accounted for the frequent long pauses, which at times were four or five seconds long. These pauses were clearly used at lexical selection points. For example, in line 17: 'uh (- -) [this pause lasted three seconds] je (- -) [two seconds] *walk* (-) je (- -) [five seconds] *walk* [...]'. Whereas Subject 2, for example, tended to fill communication disruptions, Subject 4 was content to sit and wait to retrieve a suitable lexical item. She did not particularly show determination to keep the flow going, and this may be the reason why the count of her use of achievement type strategies and other performance features in the table is so low. Subject 4 was no more in command of grammatical rules than the other subjects; however, her slow articulation rate and desire for correctness may have meant that she was using covert strategies (avoidance, for example) which did not show up here.

In the introspection after the interview, Subject 4 revealed that when under pressure her mind often went blank (line 20). In other words, different tasks may affect her speech style and her coping style. Here the long pauses could have been caused by her mind going 'blank'. One might argue that a more relaxed conversation might have meant that Subject 4 was willing to use word-coinage, for example, which could be seen as a more risky strategy than simply waiting. On the other hand, the more confident Subjects 1 and 2 did not use the more adventurous strategies in their performance any more frequently than Subject 4.

Subject 4's tendency to articulate slowly and with frequent long pauses is possible evidence for the hypothesis that use of different strategies is determined by individual personality factors. Subject 4's nervousness meant that from time to time her mind went blank, especially during lexical search. It seemed that her preference for articulating only what she felt was correct exacerbated those instances where fluency of output seemed to grind to a halt. Her usually rather reticent behaviour meant that she was not going to overcome communication disruptions by using, for example, complicated restructure, lengthy paraphrase or (as with Subject 2) frequent repetition. Whereas Subject 1 had said that she hated silences, and therefore kept the flow of speech going, Subject 4 was content to sit and wait. The following extract illustrates Subject 4's coping style at its most inefficient, in that it was painfully delivered. She was asked to say something about her school. Clearly her mind went blank (elsewhere in the interview she displayed a fairly wide range of vocabulary). She said (lines 50f.): 'uh oui uh c'est (- -) c'est petit c'est c'est (- -) uh (- -) uh (- -) uh c'est à la Gorey'. This extract shows that the speaker was so affected by what Harding (1983, p.16) calls 'internal constraints' that her strategy use was determined by her linguistic behaviour, and, by extension, her personality.

3.6 Summary of Stage One findings

The analysis of the Stage One data threw up the following points.

First, as Table 1 showed, the four subjects did not vary greatly in the number of times they used the communication strategies in the taxonomy. This factor is hard to explain, given the wide range of communicative styles in the group. In section 5 a comparison is made between this table and a similar table based on the Stage Two data. It emerges that on their return from France or Belgium the subjects did show a much wider variation in the frequency of certain strategies, and section 5 attempts to explain this disparity. It could have to do with proficiency level.

On the other hand, at Stage One there was a fairly wide variation in the use of performance features. The essential difference between compensatory strategies and the other performance features which were measured was that the former were used in a compensatory way by the subjects when they experienced difficulties in carrying out an intended message: for example, when they could not access a specific lexical item. Performance features served another purpose. They were part of the subjects' speech production, and often indicated that they were in difficulty. For example, Subject 4's long pauses were clearly more than natural pauses for planning. Performance features therefore were tied up with the question of how each subject preferred to spend the extra time she needed for planning, for testing a grammatical rule or for lexical search. Evidence to support the link between these features and the subjects' innate personality was found in the introspective comments; for example, Subject 1's assertion that she hated silences and therefore kept talking.

Finally, a comment on the use of introspective data at this stage of the study. All subjects were aware that they had experienced difficulties in communication during the L2 interview, although Subject 3 seemed over-optimistic about her general communicative performance. All four tried hard to co-operate in the introspective interview, but with varying degrees of success. Subject 1 was well able to explain (in metalinguistic terms that made sense) what her linguistic problems had been and how she tried to overcome them. Her comments were borne out in the recording of her L2 interview. The other subjects, however, were less articulate, for three possible reasons.

First, they had never been asked to comment on a specific oral performance before, and the questions came as a surprise to them. (They had not been told before their L2 interview that they would be asked to comment on their performance afterwards.) Secondly, there was the question of their own awareness or control during the interview. Many of the processes which took place during the L2 production were automatic and therefore not open for introspection. The subjects were likely to recall only those instances where automatic production broke down; and even then we are assuming that they were aware of these breakdowns. Thirdly, even if the subjects had been aware of when and why their communication broke down, they may not have possessed the terminology to describe how they coped.

It will be seen then that the slightly different method used at Stage Two to elicit introspective data produced more results with three of the four subjects. Whereas at Stage One the subjects were asked general, often rather leading questions about their performances, at Stage Two they were able to refer to what Faerch and Kasper call 'recall support' (1987, p.17). The subjects' memories were jogged by the tape of the L2 interview which was played back as they were asked to introspect. The outcome of this experiment is described in the next section, which examines the new communicative styles and the different ways of coping in L2 which the subjects used on their return to Ireland, six months later.

4 FINDINGS: STAGE TWO

4.1 Background information on the subjects' stay abroad

This chapter is concerned with an analysis of the target language interviews and corresponding introspective reports which were tape-recorded at Stage Two of this study, shortly after the subjects' return from the six-month period in France and Belgium. Some changes in each subject's coping style as it had developed over six months were noted, and these changes are described in this chapter.

First, however, additional background information is given in summary form regarding some possibly relevant external factors of the subjects' time away. Just as it was felt at the start of section 3 that the self-confidence factor, which varied from subject to subject, might have some influence on the kinds of strategies used in their oral performance, so it was felt appropriate to check what kind of L2 input they had been exposed to, and how much practice they had had in using the target language. If, for example, no changes had occurred in the coping style of a subject, it was important to know whether this was because she had had very little opportunity to perform orally in a way which tested her ability to cope.

Consequently a written question-and-answer session was held in class. (The subjects were unaware that what they wrote might be used in this study.) Three basic questions were asked. The first concerned the extent to which they had integrated into the L2 environment; whether they had been happy, whether they had made friends. It was felt that, if they had maintained a social distance, their desire to communicate in spite of linguistic difficulty could have been diminished. All four reported that they had integrated well into the community.

In response to the second question - regarding the quantity and quality of target-language input and output - all subjects reported that they took part on a daily basis in adult conversations, as well as talking to the linguistically less demanding very small children in their care. All four had therefore ample opportunity to practise their coping skills.

The third question which was put to each subject concerned their ability to cope linguistically, as they had seen it, in the L2 environment. All four said that their language skills had improved greatly. (Although space here did not permit any kind

of error analysis, it seemed that - notwithstanding the subjects' over-optimistic view of their new proficiency levels - they had all automatised enough grammatical rules to keep going much more easily in the Stage Two performance than at Stage One. Their problems were now mainly of a lexical nature.) In addition, all four subjects reported that they were now able to cope with all kinds of discourse at all kinds of level of difficulty: for example, Subject 1 described how she had used the telephone in an emergency, in spite of the lack of relevant vocabulary.

The background information which the responses provided confirmed that all subjects had been exposed to a similar L2 environment, in which they had had to practise their communicative skills and their coping skills in particular. It was,

Table 2 Summary of the subjects' use of strategies at Stage Two. (Figures refer to the number of times each strategy was used.)

Strategies	Subject 1	Subject 2	Subject 3	Subject 4
Message abandonment	1	0	1	6
Topic avoidance (see introspection)	5	1	0	1
Code-switching to L1	0	0	2	0
Paraphrase	28	10	0	12
Word-coinage	2	1	4	0
Restructuring	9	14	4	8
Retrieval: waiting to recall	0	3	3	1
Direct appeal to tester	2	3	0	1
Grammatical self-correction	0	4	6	0
Repetition	2	23	11	5
Long pauses	very few	very few	few	very few
Drawls	none	frequent	none	frequent
Use of Gambits	none	regular	none	regular

therefore, surprising to find in the analysis of the Stage Two data that Subject 3's methods of coping had not significantly changed during the six-month period. The difference between her style and those of the other three subjects is that, whereas they had - with increased proficiency - learnt to use achievement-type strategies such as paraphrase, Subject 3 had not. In a study of the use of conscious communication strategies, Tarone (1977) concluded that, as second language learners gained in proficiency, they tended to use strategies of paraphrase (p.202). She also hypothesised that 'personality factors may correlate highly with strategy preference' (p.202). In the case of Subject 3, we could speculate on the extent to which her lack of use of paraphrase was related to the kind of person she is. Subject 3's failure to introspect usefully at Stage Two is another problem which needs to be addressed.

If we compare Table 1 on page 30 with Table 2, we can see that whereas at Stage One all four subjects tended to use the same strategies at a similar frequency, at Stage Two there was much greater variance in strategy use and in other performance features. The changes in each subject's coping style will now be addressed in turn.

4.2 Profile of the coping style of Subject 1 at Stage Two

A comparison of the two tables summarising the use of strategies and other features at both stages by Subject 1 reveals that she tended to use the same ways of coping in both interviews, but with one notable exception. Whereas in the first interview she used paraphrase twice, in the Stage Two interview she used paraphrase no less than 28 times. We can say therefore that during the six-month period Subject 1 had developed a strong tendency to solve linguistic problems through paraphrase. Whereas at Stage One her problems were both grammatical and lexical, by Stage Two her problems were more lexical than grammatical. Her introspective report showed this to be the case; and it was clear from an analysis of the interview data (which is given in the Appendix) that pauses - filled or otherwise - tended to occur at lexical selection points. Her formal mastery of grammatical rules had increased during the six months to such an extent that her speech output was fairly fluent. She did not use restructuring in the middle of a grammatical unit as much as at Stage One. If we take proficiency to mean this kind of trouble-free output, then the case of Subject 1 supports Tarone's (1977) hypothesis that the use of paraphrase correlates with a fairly advanced level of proficiency.

Greater fluency (due to increased automatisation of grammatical rules) together with extensive use of paraphrase combined to make Subject 1's Stage Two oral performance appear trouble-free. As we indicated above, hesitations tended to occur either naturally at clause boundaries or when she was pressurised by the tester to produce a lexical item of which she was unsure. Even when searching for a lexical item, however, Subject 1 gave the impression that she was planning the

content of the message rather than recalling a lexical item, which the introspection revealed to be the case. For example, the hesitations in line 48 appeared to be a natural hesitation because of the native-like filler pause 'bon je ne sais pas'. In her introspection Subject 1 said of this hesitation: 'I was playing for time while thinking of how to say I took the nappy off'. Given her grasp of how to play for time in a native-like way, it is, however, surprising that Subject 1 had not taken up the habit of drawl, which is a feature of native behaviour in the target language; nor had she replaced her use of *uh* (pronounced in the L1 fashion) with the native-like *euh*.

The characteristics of Subject 1's Stage Two interview which have been mentioned so far were available for analysis in the transcriptions of the data. However, Subject 1 revealed in her introspective comments that she was a master of a more covert strategy, topic avoidance. Indeed, she revealed that she would rather 'lie' (her word) at times in order to avoid going into the details which the tester was demanding of her. Clearly this strategy of avoidance could have been formal as well as functional: she may have wanted to avoid the linguistic difficulties involved in detailed explanation. But for simplicity's sake, this strategy is referred to as topic avoidance in the taxonomy.

Subject 1 was an ideal candidate for the use of introspection. When the tape-recording of her L2 interview was played back to her immediately afterwards, I asked her to stop the tape every time she could remember experiencing a linguistic difficulty. (The tester had by now left the room.) Subject 1 stopped the tape 37 times, which in an interview lasting fourteen minutes meant a high number of stoppages. I wrote down the exact words which she spoke when she stopped the tape. These comments are given in the left-hand column of the introspective data which follows. (The line number refers to the line number in the Stage Two interview transcription given in the Appendix, pp.71-90). Subject 1 was not specifically asked to comment on the kind of strategy she used to overcome her linguistic problem. Instead I identified and categorised the strategy type according to the taxonomy on pp.25f., as I had done at Stage One. Again it must be stressed that elements of such categorisation are bound at times to be arbitrary. The types of strategies and other performance features which were thought to have been used are printed in the right-hand column of the data which follows. It should further be noted that the numbers of strategies used as recorded in Table 1 were based on my analysis of the transcription of the L2 interview. Subject 1 did not stop the tape every time there was hesitation. Table 2 is my interpretation, not hers: the introspection is based on her stopping of the tape. Pauses which lasted more than one second are transcribed (- -); pauses lasting less than one second are transcribed (-).

Subject 1's introspective report	Strategy (type used)
l.9 (- -)	
I didn't want to go into all the details,	Avoidance - message

they were too complicated	reduced
l.13 et uh (- -) It was too complicated to describe how the how the mother was seeing another man so she sent me out of the house	Functional reduction avoidance
l.18 (-) quoi The same reasons as described before (l.13)	As above
l.19 moi j'ai (- -) I couldn't find the words for how the mother treated me so I gave the same example	Restructuring, partly for linguistic simplification, partly for functional reduction
l.25 je (-) je j'ai uh I was keeping it simple - I meant I was learning no French being with the children all the time	Functional reduction, partly lexical reasons, mainly avoidance
l.34 Oh (- -) I had just understood what he meant	
ll.43f. (-) la mère (- -) ils I couldn't describe how the mother saw to everything	Restructuring, avoidance
l.47 (-) Ah oui (-) I was thinking how typical of M.B. (the tester) to want all the details in French	
l.48 bon je ne sais pas I was playing for time while thinking of how to say I took the nappy off	Retrieval (waiting) by verbalising problem, followed by restructure
l.51 il y a des choses I was trying to think of the word for fasteners	Paraphrase
ll.51f. il faut enlever il y a I still couldn't think of the word for fasteners	An alternative paraphrase
l.58 Et uh (- -) ça dépend I'd forgotten the word for baby-cream	Retrieval (waiting), then restructure

l.58 ça pour les enfants I meant baby-cream	Paraphrase
l.61 de l'eau spécifique I meant baby-cream	Paraphrase
l.70 Uh (- -) il a du mal I was trying to think of the word for nappy-rash, which I don't think I ever knew anyway	Paraphrase
l.73 c'est uh (- -) I was trying to remember the word the mother used	Retrieval (waiting), then L2 paraphrase
l.80 Oh j'ai aidé le chef I was lying here - I couldn't express the word general dogsbody	Paraphrase with no evidence of hesitation
l.84 Une (- -) cuisinière This was still a lie and I was only half sure that the word exists	Word coinage?
ll.90f. (- -) Un couteau I said this because I don't know the word for potato-peeler	Paraphrase
ll.95f. dans un (- -) instrument Thinking of the word for food-processor	Paraphrase
l.96 un (-) mixer Guessing at the word	Word coinage under L1 influence
ll.113f. grande présentation Looking for the word for display	Retrieval - lexical search and then a paraphrase under L1 influence
l.114 uh avec les (-) une Trying to express there was one big plate with small ones around	Alternative paraphrase
l.125 (-) et je prends Trying to express I take a second and third helping	Simplification - formal reduction
l.129 (-) C'était This was a lie - the dressing was not in a bottle	Reduction - functional

but I knew I didn't want to explain how to make it (due to laziness)

l.135 Non (-) c'était The same lie	As above
l.145 j'ai aidé (- -) I couldn't say I helped them to eat their food	Paraphrase with formal simplification
l.156-machine (- -) uh (- -) I couldn't explain this in English	Paraphrase
l.162 (-) uh (- -) I was thinking of the word for the plastic bowl	Paraphrase (twice)
l.176 (- -) uh (- -) I knew the word but I had forgotten it	Retrieval (waiting) (verbalised problem)
l.178 (-) il y a Trying to remember the word for switch	Paraphrase
l.180 et à (- -) I guessed the word *corde* and then remembered *fil*	Retrieval (waiting)
l.182 il y a un truc Trying to say the word for plug which I know really	Paraphrase
l.184 quelque chose Trying to think of the word for cover	Paraphrase with no hesitation
l.195 couteau Trying to think of the word for blade	Retrieval (waiting) plus two paraphrases
l.197 parties Trying to think of the word for spare parts	Paraphrase under L1 influence with hesitation following
l.201 (- -) lignes Trying to say the carrots were in rows	Retrieval (waiting) then paraphrase

On reading Subject 1's comments it becomes apparent that she was so determined to avoid potential linguistic minefields that she invented responses,

often without hesitation. At one point, when insisting that the salad dressing was ready-made, she was prepared to use two different paraphrases in order to stick to her story: 'C'était toujours dans une bouteille' (interview data line 129) and then: 'c'était toujours déjà fait' (line 135). Such linguistic behaviour was clearly linked to Subject 1's expression of her personality during that particular test; this was the way she deliberately chose to cope. Certainly her introspective remarks supported this notion.

4.3 Profile of the coping style of Subject 2 at Stage Two

The main characteristic of Subject 2's performance at Stage Two was that she seemed determined to use fast, flowing speech. Her communicative style was as it had been at Stage One, except that there were fewer disruptions in communication. During the six-month period Subject 2 had clearly acquired knowledge of grammatical rules of which she had previously been unsure; like Subject 1 her chief problem area was lack of lexical knowledge, especially when pushed by the tester to produce specific items. But even when faced with a lexical problem, Subject 2 was able to keep the speech flow going. A glance at Table 2 on page 38 shows that she achieved this through the use of considerable repetition. She used repetition in order to gain planning-time. The result was that her communication was at times garbled.

The following extract from the transcription of Subject 2's interview at Stage Two is characteristic of her coping style: 'le père il était (- -) très uh (- -) comment on dit (- -) il euh n'aime euh il n'aime il n'aimait pas quand j'ai (-) je suis sortie [...]' (lines 192ff.). These few lines illustrate the stop-start effect of Subject 2's style. As well as repetition, she frequently restructured in the middle of a grammatical unit. Whereas at Stage One she had already shown a tendency to repeat, her tendency to restructure a phrase did not appear until Stage Two.

Subject 2 had acquired the use of *euh* as opposed to *uh*, which had dominated her communicative style at Stage One. She was now able to use drawls in a native-like way in order to gain planning time, for example line 30. She had also acquired the organisers 'bon' and 'quoi', which helped fill lexical gaps. She had acquired the phrases 'tous [*sic*] les choses comme ça' and 'tout ça', which were used to pad her message; for example, lines 98f.: 'elles étaient sympas et tout ça'. (These were described as gambits in Table 2.)

Like Subject 1, Subject 2 was informative in her introspective comments. She stopped the tape 28 times—although a later analysis of the transcription showed that she had not commented on every communication disruption. Her comments and my interpretation of the strategies she used at the problem areas which she identified follow.

Subject 2's introspective report	Strategy (type used)
l.17 de: (-) I'd forgotten the word for monuments so I guessed this one and it came out right	Word-coinage under L1 influence
l.23 Oh (- -) I was surprised at the strange question	Problem came from planning the message content
l.32 un (- -) peu bizarre I didn't like the father at all — this was the first thing that came into my head, and I didn't want to explain how awful he was	Retrieval and topic avoidance
l.33 c'était juste lui je crois I was saying that it was just him, just the way he was	Paraphrase
ll.36f. c'est pas (- -) I'd forgotten the word *problème* so I said it was *ça va*	Paraphrase
l.43 le de (-) de (-) le travail I was trying to say business	Retrieval and repetition
l.49 jusqu'au à huit heures et demie le soir (-) I hesitated because I was wondering whether to whether to use the 24 hour clock	Hesitation due to socio-cultural consideration
l.50 toute (- -) I meant that was all the time he had with the children	Paraphrase
l.57 Oh (laughs) (- -) I was wondering if Monsieur B. [the tester] would mind if I said the food was terrible	Hesitation due to socio-cultural consideration
l.62 le chocolat des chocolats I think it's better to repeat to keep the conversation going	Repetition
l.73 Pâté? I didn't know if he meant French *pâté*	Repetition due to lack of comprehension

l.79 un peu (- -) I was thinking of the word for greasy	Retrieval (waiting)
l.81 graisse mais (- -) I stopped because I thought it came out wrong	Hesitation from monitoring
l.87 ce que (-) uh (-) en tout ce que I always have trouble saying the whole phrase right	Retrieval (problem due to the learner not yet having automatised the whole formula)
l.110 euh: (- -) I was thinking of the word to plug in	Retrieval (waiting) using drawl
l.113 dans (-) I was thinking for the word for opening	Retrieval (waiting), then paraphrase
l.126 je ne comprends pas I didn't understand	Direct appeal to tester
l.131 puis (- -) I was trying to say the water came out	Paraphrase
l.146 (laughs) uh (- -) I was trying to think of the word for socket which I know really; I laughed because Monsieur B. has used it in class with us	Retrieval (waiting), then paraphrase
l.153 beaucoup de (-) I hesitated because I never know if it's *beaucoup de* or *beaucoup des*	Due to the learner not having automatised the rule; evidence of monitoring
l.159 blocs comme ça (indicates with hands) I wasn't sure if the word *blocs* was right so I showed him	Gesture
l.161 quoi (- -) I couldn't remember the word for beads	Retrieval (waiting), then paraphrase

l.163 C'est les (- -) I hesitated because I couldn't think how he didn't understand what a necklace was	Problem was non-linguistic
l.164 le (-) (indicates neck) I'd forgotten the word for neck so I pointed to my neck	Gesture
l.171 sur uh sur I couldn't think of the word for thread so I remembered the word we used for washing-line	Paraphrase
l.181 C'était (- -) I was trying to say it was small enough for her to ride in	Restructuring
l.185 le (-) un (-) I was thinking of the word to say for the cab of a lorry	Retrieval (waiting), then paraphrase
l.192 il était (- -) I didn't want to go into how the father didn't trust me taking the children out	Avoidance and paraphrase

The introspective comments show that Subject 2 had been sensitive to the interactive nature of the interview: for example, her comments on lines 57 and 146. Her comment which explained the repetition of 'chocolat' (line 62) showed that she was aware of the fact that she used repetition as a strategy, and also explained the reason why. She said: 'I think it's better to repeat to keep the conversation going'. Her tendency to use repetition, which had been observed at Stage One, had, by Stage Two, become part of her natural performance style.

4.4 Profile of the coping style of Subject 3 at Stage Two

The data which was elicited from Subject 3 at Stage Two was interesting for two reasons. First, her coping style, when evaluated in terms of her use of communication strategies and other performance features in our taxonomy, had hardly changed during the six-month period. Secondly, Subject 3 was not able to comment introspectively on her performance, except on a few instances where communication breakdown was obviously marked.

To take her coping style first: Table 2 on page 38 shows a low frequency of the use of compensatory strategies; as low as it had been at Stage One. It was particularly surprising to see that Subject 3 did not make use of paraphrase, any more than she had at Stage One (compare Table 1 with Table 2). Her general communicative style was still much the same in terms of other performance

features. There was, for instance, no use of drawls or other native-like gambits. Her speech flow was delivered in a slow, measured style as it had been at Stage One. Restructure and self-correction did not help to ease the flow. An example of her at times painful efforts is in lines 14ff.: 'et on a et pour le mois juillet j'ai je suis allée en France et uh (-) au Bretagne et à Brest (-) à Brest aussi (-) et on a et pour le mois juillet j'ai je suis restée [...]'.

It is clear from the above extract that Subject 3's proficiency level was such that she needed to use strategies to compensate for lack of grammatical and lexical knowledge. Unlike the other three Subjects, however, she did not use the knowledge at her disposal to overcome difficulties by using paraphrase, for example. Instead, she had acquired during the period in Belgium and France a tendency which was not included in the taxonomy - for reasons already given in section 3 - the strategy of formal simplification. Subject 3's way out was to simplify a grammatical structure. For example, she frequently used the present tense, inappropriately, possibly to avoid a more complex syntactic structure. This possibility is speculation, however. It was not possible to investigate syntactic structures further because of the relatively small scale of this study. Error analysis had been deliberately omitted in order to keep within this scale. However, on hearing the tape, it was possible to draw a subjective conclusion that Subject 3's methods for coping with lack of lexical and grammatical knowledge were: (i) simplification and (ii) transfer from L1 rules and expressions. Her speech was punctuated with non-native-like expressions, with the result that it seemed that she was translating her thoughts from L1 into L2 in a slow, conscious manner. Her use of *yeah* (pronounced in L1 fashion) and *ugh* contributed to the impression that her speech was under L1 influence.

The following introspective comments made by Subject 3 were all that she was able to say about her performance:

Subject 3's introspective report	Strategy (type used)
l.33 ils sont (- -) monstres	
I knew the word, the parents used it to describe their children	Retrieval (waiting)
l.80 dans le (-)	
I was trying to think of the word for saucepan	Word-coinage
l.90 vous mettez uh (- -) le	
I was trying to think of the word for saucepan	Word-coinage (for the same lexical item as above, but with a different result)

l.104 un grand uh (- -)

I still couldn't think of the word for saucepan	Word-coinage (for the same lexical item as above, but with a different result)

l.158 c'était (- -)

I didn't notice the name of the wine, I don't know anything about wines in English anyway	Verbalises problem and then retrieves after hesitation

It can be seen that Subject 3 stopped the tape of the L2 interview only five times. Like the other subjects, she was asked to stop the tape each time she recalled experiencing difficulty in putting across what she had wanted to say. (The tape was played twice.) Subject 3 commented that she thought she was fine and had had very few problems. Three of the five instances of difficulty which she did recall centred around her search for the word for saucepan, and her subsequent word-coinage. These instances were the most obvious examples of Subject 3 in linguistic difficulty. The reason for her lack of introspective comments on other communication disruptions, of which there were several, is less clear. Possible reasons are explored in section 5.

4.5 Profile of the coping style of Subject 4 at Stage Two

Subject 4's general communicative style at Stage Two resembled that of Stage One, in that she was still the least responsive of the subjects. Again she tried to get away with one- or two-word responses. This time, however, the whole tone and direction of her discourse was so confident that there were no long unfilled pauses, no indications that her mind went blank as it had at Stage One. If she did have problems, Subject 4 was clever at disguising them.

For one thing, she had acquired the use of the native-like drawled filler *euh:* to help her speech flow as she tried to access lexical items. This, together with the native-like filler [bɛ] concealed the problems over lexis which her introspection revealed that she had experienced. An example of her new-found style is in line 70. Her introspective comment was that she was looking for the word for 'steam'. She used an organiser ('bon') to gain time, then a drawl followed by a restructure, by which time she had accessed the correct item: 'Bon il y avait le: la vapeur'.

Subject 4 had learnt to use paraphrase, often without hesitation. At the same time Table 2 on page 38 shows that she was content to abandon her message as many as six times in the Stage Two interview. In theory, this kind of reduction strategy might be considered inferior to the more achievement-based strategy of paraphrase, which is expansive in essence. However, Subject 4 used the strategy of message abandonment in such a way that her performance and ability to commu-

nicate were not diminished. On the contrary, she managed to make the use of this strategy seem part of natural speech style. Interestingly, the tester did not very often take up the reference once it had been dropped. For example, in line 136, Subject 4 was trying to say that the animals' heads were stuffed. She said: 'Et on a fait quelque chose avec les pour (- -)'. Her tone was such that the lexical search sounded part of natural speech. Later, when pressed to find another word to express 'stuffing' Subject 4 used her discourse skills to avoid the tester pressing her further. The following extract shows that she fended him off by going on the offensive herself, having abandoned the search for the L2 item for 'stuffing'. Subject 4 said that she did not know the word because she had never asked: 'Pour faire (- -) je n'ai pas je n'ai pas demandé' (line 152).

In her introspective comments (which follow) Subject 4 showed an ability to recall and sometimes explain as many as 30 instances of when she had experienced communication difficulties. Like Subject 1, she was happy on one occasion to use an approximation for a lexical item and keep to her story when challenged (line 57: 'I knew he didn't believe me when I said I used a glass but I stuck to it'). Her comments proved to give the fullest account of the communication disruptions heard on the tape; nearly all the problem areas and corresponding strategies which I identified were also picked up by Subject 4.

Subject 4's introspective report	Strategy type used
ll.13f. dans une (-)	
I'd forgotten the word for *abattoir* even though I know it very well	Repetition during lexical search
l.14 puis le: le père	
I couldn't think of his exact job title	Retrieval (drawl), then repetition, then restructure
l.22 j'ai: j'ai mis la table	
I was wondering how to say the mother brought the dinner home from the canteen	Drawl and repetition
l.34 Bon (-)	
I had forgotten the word for ironing-board	Retrieval using an L2 filler, then paraphrase
l.38 Puis dans cette maison	
I said this because I didn't want to have to go on about how you used the iron	Topic avoidance

l.47 (- -) Bon dans le (- -) I forgot the word for socket	Retrieval (waiting, then an L2 filler, then waiting, then paraphrase, then the lexical item comes with uncertainty - see rising intonation)
l.53 pour faire que ça (- -) ça I wanted to say it was a steam-iron	Reduction - message abandonment
l.55 (- -) Avec un: verre I forgot the word for jug so I said it was a glass	Retrieval (waiting, then use of drawl, then paraphrase)
l.57 (-) avec un verre I knew he didn't believe me when I said I used a glass but I stuck to it	Conscious decision to stick with the same paraphrase
l.58 une petite (-) lumière I wasn't sure if this was the right word	Paraphrase, approximation
l.67 pour faire les différents euh: I meant to say materials	Reduction, message abandoned with use of L2 filler
l.70 le: la vapeur I was trying to remember the word	Retrieval (use of drawl)
l.80 Non (- -) This was true, they didn't fall over	Naturally occurring hesitation
l.95 c'était (-) un vieux I was trying to say the farmhouse	Retrieval (repetition, then waiting, then a simplification of the lexical item)

l.97 il y avait (- -) autres maisons I was looking for the word for outhouses	Retrieval (repetition) waiting then a paraphrase, again a simplification)
l.98 la foin (-) la paille I meant straw so I said hay instead	Lexical substitution with no hesitation
l.109 C'étaient les maisons comme dans un ferme I meant outhouses but I don't know the French for it	Paraphrase with no drawl or hesitation
l.110 c'était: oui c'était pas I was explaining an outhouse	A second paraphrase for the same lexical item
ll.113f. c'était euh: (- -) c'était que pour les animaux He still wanted the word	A third paraphrase for the same lexical item
ll.114f. (- -) ou pour mettre la paille pour euh: He still wanted the word	A fourth paraphrase plus use of drawl in L2
l.133 les têtes (- -) I wish I hadn't mentioned those stuffed heads	Hesitation occurs naturally
l.134 des animaux I meant they were stuffed	Paraphrase
l.136 pour (- -) I didn't know the word for stuffing	Reduction - message abandonment
l.139 c'était (- -) I was trying to say the word for deer	Retrieval (waiting and restructure and then change of message)
l.141 il y avait les (- -) I still couldn't think how to say deer	Retrieval (waiting), then message abandonment
l.149 tout ce qu'il y a dedans I meant their insides	Paraphrase with

	no hesitation
l.150 pour faire (- -) I meant stuffing them	Reduction - abandonment (following a paraphrase)
l.152 Pour faire I couldn't think of the word for stuffing	Abandonment
l.160 qui étaient elle avait I meant they were attached to the boiler	Restructure - paraphrase
l.167 (- -) Le: I didn't know what he meant	Reception problem - use of drawl

4.6 Summary of Stage Two findings

We saw by the end of section 3 that in the Stage One interviews all four subjects used roughly the same communication strategies at nearly the same levels of frequency, in order to overcome their linguistic problems, which were both grammatical and lexical in origin. However, their general communicative styles were different enough for it to be possible to identify different uses of performance features. For example, Subject 2 tended to use repetition as a means of gaining planning time, while Subject 4 paused for a long time while she tried to access a grammatical rule of lexical item. At that stage only Subject 1 responded well to the elicitation of introspective reports, but the way it was elicited (i.e. with no recall support) may have been responsible for the less good response from the other three.

At Stage Two, however, there was a marked contrast between not only the general communicative styles of the subjects, but also between their individual ways of coping with what was now lack of lexical knowledge (rather than lack of knowledge of grammatical rules). Subject 1 now used paraphrase with good effect; Subject 4 used a range of strategies, including message abandonment and other native-like performance features to give the impression that she could cope. Subject 2's tendency to use repetition as a time-gaining strategy was even stronger at Stage Two than at Stage One. These three subjects showed in their introspective comments that they consciously used these particular strategies in order to keep up a good performance.

Subject 3's Stage Two overall performance, however, was more difficult to interpret. Although her formal mastery of the target language had clearly increased, she had not acquired the use of achievement-type strategies in the taxonomy (although she used word-coinage when searching for a particular lexical item). Instead, Subject 3 tended to use the L1 based strategy of literal translation and simplified syntactic structures. Unlike the other subjects, she was able to recall

only a few instances on the tape when she had experienced communication difficulties.

5 CONCLUSION

5.1 Conclusions arising from the findings

The prime objective of this study was to test the hypothesis that second language learners develop their own distinctive ways of coping in oral interaction. The results of the data analysis showed this to be the case. A second objective was to test the use of learner introspection as a means of gaining insight into some of the processes which take place during oral performance in the target language. This study showed that learners vary in their ability to recall or verbalise these processes; they also vary in the degree of their linguistic awareness during and after their oral performances.

To take up the question of the relationship between individual performance styles and the personality of the individual: throughout the discussion the term personality proved too loose and ill-defined to be applicable. Instead, what was at issue was the way a small group of subjects chose to behave linguistically (i.e. express their personalities through language) in a particular context on two particular occasions. At first it had been thought that differing coping styles might be linked to whether the speaker was a more extroverted or introverted person, but such a link was not found. It was regrettable that the time constraints of the study meant that it was not possible to explore the relationship between each subject's linguistic behaviour and cognitive style in L2 and L1. Although the problem of lack of lexical and grammatical knowledge would not have been there in an L1 context, it would have been interesting to see whether Subject 2, for example, tended to use repetition in L1 as much as in her L2 interviews, or whether 'lying' was part of Subject 1's linguistic behaviour in L1 as it had been in her L2 performance.

The disparity between the coping styles of the four subjects was more strongly marked at Stage Two than at Stage One; in particular there was a wide disparity in the use of compensatory communication strategies at Stage Two. It was observed that Subject 1 had developed a tendency to use paraphrase, Subject 2 used repetition even more frequently than at Stage One, and Subject 4 used a mixture of compensatory strategies as well as reduction strategies (message abandonment) and native-like performance features. These three subjects all gave the general impression that they coped well in an L2 interview. Subject 3, however, came across as less competent. There were two possible explanations for her sounding less fluent: first, she tended to overcome her linguistic problems through the use of simplification and literal translation from L1 and did not use the kind of achievement-based strategies used by the other subjects. In addition, she had not acquired the use of any native-like performance features; the non-lexicalised fillers were pronounced in an entirely L1 way, and there were no drawls.

It must be pointed out that Subject 3 was not the only one who had not acquired the habit of using drawls and native-like fillers. We saw in section 4 how Subject 1, who in all other aspects of her performance at Stage Two showed that she had increased in fluency and proficiency during the six-month period, had not, however, acquired the native-like drawled filler *euh*. (Subjects 2 and 4, on the other hand, used this device in order to gain planning time, and their performances were as a result the better for it.) This disparity in the use of the drawled native-like filler leads to the speculation that the use of this performance feature is somehow personality-related as well. Perhaps the non-adoption of native-like non-lexicalised fillers is connected with the speaker's unwillingness to exchange a small part of his or her L1-based personality for a new 'foreign' speech sound which falls outside the target language's formal structures. Subjects 1 and 3 were at both Stages One and Two unwilling to express themselves non-lexically in a native-like way, whereas Subjects 2 and 4 were quite at ease in their use of native-like non-lexicalised fillers. (These two subjects had, interestingly, also taken on the use of one or two gambits, unlike the other two.) This phenomenon leads to the tentative conclusion that each learner follows a language-independent personality-related agenda in his or her development of a communicative style. In the agendas of Subjects 2 and 4 a priority was to use native-like hesitation phenomena; whereas for Subjects 1 and 3 there were other priorities. Only a further, Stage Three analysis could determine when or whether Subjects 1 and 3 might choose to adopt the use of native-like time-gaining devices as part of their strategic competence.

A comparison of the four subjects' coping styles inevitably leads to the question whether some strategies are more effective than others; effective in the sense that they are produced to sound like part of natural speech.

It is tempting to create a hierarchy of communication strategies based on the analysis of the four subjects' performances, possibly ranging from a long pause at a lexicial selection point (indicating that the speaker is waiting to recall an item) at the bottom to the use of paraphrase at the top. From the data it could be said that clever use of message abandonment, for example, as displayed in Subject 4's Stage Two interview, was extremely effective. However, it was effective only because it was used in that particular interaction. In other words, Subject 4's strategic competence was inseparable from her pragmatic competence. The use of message abandonment was effective in that particular discourse type. However, in another context, it might be an ineffective strategy: if, for example, the speaker had to warn another of impending danger. Therefore all we can say is that in a particular context only certain strategies come across more effectively than others. In this task, the L2 interview, it was crucial for the subjects to keep the channel of communication open. Their introspection showed that they were aware of the importance for them of trying to keep going: both the nature of the task and the tester's manner required that they should. Performance features such as drawled fillers were as effective a way of keeping communication going as the more sophisticated paraphrases which

were a result of the speaker making use of her L2 knowledge. Any hierarchy of effective communication strategies would have to include mention of performance features as well as compensatory strategies.

Before we leave the question of different coping styles as displayed by these subjects, mention must be made of the possible link between a learner's general proficiency level and the use of certain communication strategies. Although the idea of a hierarchy of strategies must depend on the context in which they are used, it was clear that the increased number of times that some of the subjects used compensatory strategies was linked in some way to their increased command of the grammatical rules of the target language. For example, Subject 1's marked increase in the use of paraphrase was dependent on her increased competence in grammar and lexis. As was mentioned earlier, Tarone (1977) linked paraphrase to greater proficiency. In this study there did seem to be a link between greater use of L2-based strategies and greater formal mastery of the target language. Conversely, there was seen in Subject 3's Stage Two performance a correlation between a lower level of formal mastery (as evidenced in her halting performance and apparent lack of automatisation of rules) and an extremely low level of the use of paraphrase (i.e. none) in the Stage Two interview.

It was not in the brief of this study to investigate the proficiency level of each subject in terms of errors. Nevertheless, it must be said that Subject 3 did display frequent surprising errors; surprising in that she was making gross errors after six months' immersion in an L2 environment—during which time she reported having been happy and well-integrated. Whether she was more field-independent by nature than the others is hard to say. However, one wonders if her slowness to acquire as much declarative knowledge as the other subjects might be linked to her almost total inability to introspect on her Stage Two performance.

It was seen in section 4 that in the case of Subjects 1, 2 and 4 learner involvement through the use of introspection gave great help in the analysis of the data, particularly as regards the use of covert strategies. Subject 3, however, was able to comment on only a few obvious trouble-spots. She did not seem to possess the same level of awareness of strategy use as the other subjects, and certainly could not express this awareness. On the other hand, her fairly frequent corrections of a grammatical item were evidence that she was monitoring her output in a conscious way. It seemed that lack of procedural knowledge and the consequent amount of attention she had to pay to the use of this knowledge did not allow room for conscious use of compensatory strategies.

The case of Subject 3 leads to some general remarks which might explain her performance. First, it could be said that because her attention was devoted to the production of correct rules and appropriate lexical items, she consciously used fewer compensatory strategies than the other subjects, and therefore did not recall her strategy use. If this were the case, one might conclude that only those learners with a certain level of automatised knowledge are likely to introspect in great detail.

Alternatively one could say that Subject 3 simply lacked a more global metalinguistic awareness; she could not identify psycholinguistic processes, let alone comment on them. Certainly she did not isolate instances when she was clearly in linguistic difficulty. It was as though she were incapable of commenting on a stretch of speech. (Interestingly she achieved the highest grade at shorthand, which would indicate there was nothing wrong with her 'ear'.) Further studies of oral performances of other learners like Subject 3 would need to be undertaken to explain her inability to introspect.

5.2 Pedagogic implications of the study

It might seem inappropriate to speculate on possible pedagogic implications arising from a study which centred on only four subjects from a specific learning environment, performing a specific task. However, there are one or two general observations to be made which might be useful to a teaching programme involving the teaching of strategic competence to a similar learner group.

First, it was clear in the study that learners' use of certain communication strategies was part of their natural communicative style. The four subjects showed a natural preference for one particular type of strategy or another. Therefore one cannot assume that all learners from the same group are going to require the same amount and the same kind of advice in order to improve their ability to cope linguistically. On the other hand, it is likely that their common proficiency level will mean that their problem sources will be similar; we saw that the greater the proficiency level, the more likely it was that the problem sources were lexical in nature. At the same time, individual psycholinguistic problems must be taken into account (as, for example, Subject 4's mind going blank in lexical search). The teaching of strategic competence must therefore be approached with individual needs in mind.

Secondly, any taxonomy of communication strategies must take into account the context or discourse type in which the ability to cope is required. We saw in the case of Subject 3 that even fairly mature learners do not automatically transfer their L1-based pragmatic competence into the L2 context (given that they possess pragmatic competence in a similar L1 task). It may well be that the Stage Two performances of Subjects 1, 2 and 4 could serve as models of effective use of compensatory strategies and other performance features within the specific context of an L2 interview - even a job interview.

Thirdly, the study showed that not all advanced learners possess an innate awareness of how they produce speech in L2, or that they can identify their linguistic problems. Although Subject 1 in particular was able to articulate her problems and, to a certain degree, how she overcame them, the case of Subject 3 showed that learners differ widely in the degree of linguistic awareness they possess. Clearly, a learner like Subject 3 would have to be introduced to the concept and role of communication strategies in an entirely different way from the approach

taken with a learner like Subject 1. It seems reasonable to suggest that a learner-centred approach should be taken to the teaching of strategic competence, based on the learners' individual needs and linguistic capabilities.

APPENDIX

Stage One, Subject 1 - Interview

Transcription of a tape-recorded interview between the tester (T) and Subject 1 (S1). (Words pronounced with an entirely L1 pronunciation are italicised.)

1	T	Bonjour
2	S1	Bonjour Monsieur
3	T	Est-ce que vous pourriez me dire qu'est-ce que vous
4		avez fait pour votre classe secrétariale pendant l'année?
5	S1	Uh j'ai fait uh (-) beaucoup de matières uh (-)
6		uh le dactylographie le sténographie des uh les uh
7		traitements de textes informatisés des uh les uh
8		(-) lettres dans le français commercial uh (- -) et
9		aussi dans l'anglais commercial et les choses comme ça
10	T	Oui d'accord oui euh est-ce que vous pourriez me
11		dire comment vous venez a l'école?
12	S1	(- -) ah c'était très bien à l'école uh j'ai fait j'avais
13		réussi dans beaucoup de mes matières uh j'ai j'avais fait le
14		certificat Intermediate et uh (-) après cela les les
15		professeurs étaient très uh (-) différents à les (-) uh
16		(-) à nous.
17	T	Oui oui est-ce que vous pourriez me dire comment vous venez
18		à l'école?
19	S1	(-) Uh (- -) très bien
20	T	Oui d'accord Est-ce que euh pour arriver à l'école est-ce que
21		vous prenez le bus?
22	S1	Oui je prends le bus de mon ville et l'arrêt d'autobus n'est
23		pas très loin de chez moi et uh (-) j'avais je dois marcher
24		à mon (-) à collège
25	T	Et où est-ce que vous descendez exactement à Rathmines?
26	S1	Uh (- -) à Rathmines
27	T	Oui d'accord (-) je crois que vous allez partir en France
28		c'est vrai?
29	S1	Oui
30	T	Et qu'est-ce que vous attendez de votre séjour en France?

31	S1	Uh je voudrais perfecter mon français (-) être (-) de
32		parler plus forcement et de (- -) pouvoir le culture en
33		France et comment uh (- -) tous les choses marchent en
34		France parce que je sais que c'est très différent en France
35		entre Irlande et uh (-) je veux voir comment la vie de
36		travail et la vie habituelle (- -)
37	T	D'accord et quand vous irez en France où est-ce que vous
38		allez être?
39	S1	A Paris probablement (-) au sud de Paris parce que j'ai uh
40		(-) un ami qui habite au sud de Paris et peut-être il
41		me trouve il me trouvera une famille
42	T	Très bien est-ce que vous comptez vous loger chez la famille?
43	S1	Oui probablement
44	T	D'accord est-ce que vous avez déjà travaillé quelquepart?
45	S1	Ah oui (- -) j'ai travaillé dans un agence de (- -) de
46		voyages il y a deux étés et (-) et maintenant
47		je travaille dans un pub uh (-) trois (- -) soirs par
48		semaine
49	T	Et qu'est-ce que vous pensez de ce travail?
50	S1	Uh (- -) c'est très uh (-) très utile pour moi parce
51		que c'est [æmitei] et je (-) les heures de travail ne
52		sont pas (- -) très longues (-) très uh (- -) et l'argent
53		est bon parce que les (-) les uh (-) clients me donnent
54		beaucoup donnent quelque l'argent et c'est séparé de notre
55		salaire
56	T	Oui d'accord maintenant est-ce que vous pourriez me raconter
57		(-) euh est-ce que vous pourriez me décrire un petit peu
58		votre école secondaire?
59	S1	Ah oui uh (- -) j'ai fait les matières quelque (-) non
60		(-) un petit peu comme les matières ici (- -) j'ai fait les
61		ordinateurs uh (-) et les autres matières habituelles pour
62		les pour les études (-) mais j'ai fait beaucoup de sports
63		à l'école j'ai fait du hockey et nous avons allées
64		à uh au Holland pour jouer et uh pour tous les
65		mercredis après-midi nous avons fait de sport (-) et
66		c'etait très bien et nous avons beaucoup de uh (-) des
67		clubs de (-) *clubs* (-) à l'école pour danser et chanter et
68		quelque chose comme ça
69	T	Donc en somme vous avez aimé votre école secondaire
70	S1	Ah oui (-) c'était bien mais je préfère uh l'école ici
71	T	Pourquoi?
72	S1	Parce que je pense que uh (-) tout le monde ici (- -)

73		uh a le meme uh idée uh pour aller en France et pour étudier
74		le français (-) tout le monde aime le français beaucoup
75		et que uh dans le [kaɪtiei] on parle français avec
76		nous-mêmes et (-) c'est très bien parce que uh nous partagez
77		*no* partageons (-) nos uh idées de la France (-) et
78		quelques (- -) des filles dans la classe étaient dans le
79		(-) dans le France déjà et elles peuvent nous dire uh
80		(- -) beaucoup de choses qui (laughs)
81	T	Très bien voilà (laughs)

Stage One, Subject 1 — Introspection

Transcription of a tape-recorded interview between the researcher (JR) and Subject 1 (S1).

1	JR	Do you like speaking French?
2	S1	Yeah I do
3	JR	Do you experience any problems like you might have had just now?
4	S1	Yeah when you're heading for a word and you can't really you
5		don't really (-) like you know the word in English but you
6		can't think of the actual word in French (-) and in French
7		there's so many words for the one word in English (-) I mean
8		I suppose it's the same the other way round but like in French
9		there's so many words for the one word.
10	JR	Well now you're thinking of this word in English and what happens?
11		You get nearer this word and what are you saying to yourself?
12	S1	I mean either you'd find a way round saying it or else you'd
13		say something that just doesn't make sense (-) I mean some-
14		times you just keep going (laughs)
15	JR	And on what occasions would you keep going and on what occasions
16		would you stop?
17	S1	Well I think it's easier to keep going if you're talking to a
18		French person (-) because you can communicate and you can use
19		your hands as well and they understand that you're a foreigner
20		(-) but if I'm talking to a teacher then I would stop (-)
21		because then I would know I'd be making a mistake I'd be more
22		conscious of it
23	JR	Do you listen out for your mistakes? Do you try and be accurate?
24	S1	Yeah I do I think it's conscious effort I think you have to
25	JR	But do you correct yourself at all when you're speaking French?
26	S1	Uh (-) I try to keep going I think you're better off to keep
27		going.

28	JR	So if you hear a mistake you'd rather keep going (-) you
29		put up with the mistake you'd made
30	S1	Well I say (-) if I make it noticeable I kind of say Oh God
31		and I try to keep going
32	JR	Do you try and buy time and sort of fill in with phrases at all?
33	S1	Well I'm learning to do that (laughs)
34	JR	You're learning to do that?
35	S1	Yeah
36	JR	What is a favourite phrase you might use?
37	S1	Oh (-) *je veux dire*
38	JR	But it doesn't come naturally yet?
39	S1	No not really no
40	JR	What do you thing about your accent?
41	S1	Uh (- -) I think it's come more now from learning from
42		M.B. (the teacher) and in school I didn't have an accent at all
43	JR	What do you mean you didn't have an accent?
44	S1	Because we didn't even try you know (-) you feel too stupid
45	JR	You try now do you?
46	S1	Yeah
47	JR	So you hear yourself trying to speak as a French person would?
48	S1	I do yes
49	JR	What about grammar? Do you have problems with then when
50		you're speaking?
51	S1	I'm OK more or less with the past present and future
52		but anything else now it's hard (-) and I tend to say to use
53		a verb that would I mean like *je dois faire* (-) you have to
54		use the subjunctive you know like
55	JR	But you have avoided the subjunctive today have you? Were you
56		aware of that?
58	S1	No (laughs) no (-) I don't really know how to use it (-)
59		and to put it into practice when you're talking
60		that's difficult.

Stage One, Subject 2 - Interview

Transcription of a tape-recorded interview between the tester (T) and Subject 2 (S2).

1	T	Bonjour
2	S2	Bonjour Monsieur
3	T	Est-ce que vous pourriez me raconter ce que vous avez
4		fait pendant l'année à l'école?

5	S2	Uh oui uh j'ai commencé uh uh pendant le mois de septembre
6		et uh (- -) j'ai uh j'ai pris les classes comme dactylo-
7		graphie la sténographie (-) le traitement de textes le
8		l'anglais commercial et le français commercial (- -) uh
9		et je pense que j'ai fait bien dans tous les classes (- -) uh
10		et j'espère que j'ai uh réservé une place (-) en France
11	T	Très bien (-) est-ce vous pourriez me dire comment vous
12		venez à l'école
13	S2	Uh (- -) uh uh je uh prends uh l'autobus uh (-) ou dans
14		le matin quand uh mon père travaille dans le uh à Dublin uh
15		uh il uh (-) va uh il conde il conduite dans la voiture
16		et uh (-) je vais avec lui dans la voiture et uh mais
17		tout uh le plupart de le temps j'ai je prends l'autobus
18	T	Et si vous prenez l'autobus quel numéro est-ce que
19		vous prenez?
20	S2	Uh le le quarante-six
21	T	Bon d'accord et où est-ce que vous descendez?
22	S2	Uh (laughs) ca dépende (- -) si j'arrive à Appian Way environ
23		à neuf heures je descende et je prende le (-) dix-huit
24		numéro mais si c'est environ neuf heures et dix (-) je vais au
25		Leeson Street et je descende et je prende (-) un il y a
26		beaucoup d'autobus qui vais uh va à Rathmines et je prende
27		une d'autobus
28	T	D'accord (-) vous allez partir en France oui?
29	S2	Oui
30	T	Et qu'est-ce que vous attendez de votre séjour en France?
31	S2	Qu'est-ce que j'attendez?
32	T	Qu'est-ce que vous euh
33	S2	Je ne je ne comprends pas la question
34	T	Bon d'accord euh qu'est-ce que vous pensez faire en France?
35	S2	Pendant les six mois?
36	T	Oui pendant les six mois
37	S2	Uh (-) je travaillerai comme jeune fille au pair et
38		j'espère que uh (-) j'apprendrerai la langue et la culture
39		et les traditions (-) françaises uh (-) mais uh c'est né-
40		cessaire pour moi de parler le français tout le temps et à cause
41		de ça de cela (- -) uh je travaillerai avec les enfants
42		(-) et avec mon famille unie uh dans mon
43		situation quand j'irai
44	T	Et où est-ce que vous allez rester où est-ce que vous
45		allez vivre?
46	S2	Uh (-) j'espère dans la maison avec la famille mais (-)

uh (-) j'ai la chance d'avoir une famille à Paris et si
j'irai j'ai une appartement (-) une petite immeuble
pour moi

T Superbe (laughs) superbe (- -) est-ce que vous avez déjà
travaillé?

S2 Oui mais uh uh (-) pas en France en Irlande

T Bon en Irlande où est-ce que vous avez travaillé?

S2 (laughs) Oh beaucoup de places (-) uh (-) comme les
grands magasins uh comme Roches Stores et (- -)
dans un pub (-) c'est un expérience (laughs)

T (laughs)

S2 Et dans une boutique aussi

T Et en général est-ce que vous avez travaillé avec le
public?

S2 Ah oui oui (-) et avec l'argent et à la à la (- -) caisse

T Bien (-) et est-ce que vous pouvez me décrire comment
était votre école secondaire?

S2 Comment?

T Comment était votre école secondaire ?

S2 Ah oui uh (- -) j'ai l'aime beaucoup (- -) je je
suis allée (-) au (-) à l'école uh (-) pour uh pour
des filles seulement (-) mais c'était (-) c'était bon
j'ai (-) j'ai (-) apprendu beaucoup et (-) j'ai
réussi des points pour aller ici

T Oui d'accord et est-ce que vous préférez cette école ou
votre école secondaire?

S2 (- -) uh (- -) je crois que (-) qu'il n'est pas il
n'est pas une différence mais uh (-) j'ai fait un an dans une
autre école qui uh avait des garçons et des filles (-) et je
crois que je préfère uh je préfère une école avec les garçons
et les filles (- -) parce que (-) il vous préparez pour
pour la vie quand vous quittez l'école (-) parce que
quand je quitte mon première école je ne je ne suis pas
préparé pour la vie et pour (- -) rencontrer les des
garçons (-) et comme ça (-) pour avoir (- -) un
ami (-) un copain (laughs)

T Bon (laughs) je vous remercie

S2 Au revoir (laughs)

Stage One, Subject 2 - Introspection

Transcription of a tape-recorded interview between the researcher (JR) and Subject 2 (S2).

JR Just now when you were talking French did you notice yourself avoiding words that you didn't know and therefore not mentioning them?

S2 Yeah I tried to stick to the vocabulary I had and because of that I was stopping and trying to think of other words for it I just used the same verb like *aller* that's something I'm used to using (-) I'm always afraid of saying the wrong thing

JR Are you conscious of having what you might call fillers in other words would you consciously use a particular phrase do you have a favourite phrase?

S2 No (laughs) I just say what comes to my head and if it doesn't come to my head I have to stop and think whether it's right and if it isn't I have to think of some other word

JR If you're heading for a word you don't know what do you do?

S2 (uh) I go Uh (laughs)

JR You go Uh

S2 Yeah (laughs)

JR And when you are going Uh are you trying to think of the right word?

S2 Yeah I'm thinking of the word and then maybe something that will be the same in French (-) obviously I don't have all the vocabulary (-) maybe there's a word that I've heard before and I'm just trying to recall it

JR Would you ever find yourself taking a risk (-) you'd rather say the word and it may be wrong or would you prefer not to say it?

S2 I'd prefer not to say it

JR Now what happens if you hear yourself making a big mistake and you hear it what do you do?

S2 I fumble

JR You fumble

S2 Yes I can't go on I always have to go back and try to correct it but then I make things worse but it happens anyway

JR You mean you lose the thread of what you're saying?

S2 Yeah yeah

JR So to sum up what's your main problem ?

S2 I think maybe people's reaction towards the way I speak and (-)

JR You mean your teacher or the other girls in the class?

39	S2	No no it's (-) hard to explain really it's just the way I've been
40		taught how to speak French (-) and the accent itself is different
41		it's a very English accent and you're very conscious of it
42		when you have a French-speaking teacher (-) and there's the
43		other girls who have been to France and they have the
44		accent and it's very obvious to yourself and I'm sort of
45		inclined not to speak and answer questions or whatever
46	JR	So (-) is it mainly your accent or not knowing the
47		words that bothers you?
48	S2	It's the accent it's the accent (-) the vocabulary well
49		in most cases I'd be able to get around that and I'd be
50		able to think of something else to say for it
51	JR	Do you have any grammatical problems when you speak?
52	S2	Verbs
53	JR	Do you mean agreements or tenses?
54	S2	I think more or less conjugation the third person singular
55		or whatever (-) I thought myself like like my tenses were fine
56	JR	What about gender *le* or *la*
57	S2	No no
58	JR	Do you hazard a guess then?
59	S2	Mainly (laughs) it usually works out
60	JR	O.K. thanks

Stage One, Subject 3 - Interview

Transcription of a tape-recorded interview between the tester (T) and Subject 3 (S.3). Words pronounced with an entirely L1 pronunciation are italicised.

1	T	Bonjour
2	S3	Bonjour Monsieur
3	T	Bon est-ce que vous pourriez me dire qu'est-ce que vous
4		faisiez à cette école (-) cette année?
5	S3	Oh oui nous uh nous travaillons beaucoup de choses (-)
6		nous uh (-) j'ai apprendu uh sténographie la dactylographie
7		(-) le commer l'anglais commercial le français commercial
8		(- -) uh (- -) et beaucoup de choses
9	T	Oui d'accord très bien (-) est-ce que vous pouvez me
10		dire comment vous venez à l'école le matin?
11	S3	Uh (- -) uh (coughs) (-) j'ai venu en le train (-)
12		et donc et puis je j'ai uh uh j'ai pris le train le bus deux
13		bus et uh uh donc j'arriverai uh j'arrive uh j'ai arrivé
14		au Rathmines

T Oui d'accord et à Rathmines où est-ce que vous descendez exactement?

S3 Uh (-) j'a descendu au le bus au (-) auprès de *Kentucky Fried Chicken* (-) et j'ai uh j'ai uh (- -) prendre (-) la rue à cette école

T D'accord voilà (-) je crois que vous partez en France

S3 Oui uh je pars (-) (coughs) je serai (-) j'aurai Bruxelles et il y a deux enfants dans la famille et pour juillet j'irai au Brittany et pour août uh (-) j'irai au le sud de la France (-) et puis uh je uh (-) je retournerai uh uh à Bruxelles et uh (-) je retrouverai une autre famille pour septembre

T D'accord (-) et qu'est-ce que vous attendez de votre séjour?

S3 (-) Uh (-) le séjour est pour six mois mais uh donc uh je resterai avec cette famille pour trois mois et (- -) uh

T Est-ce que vous croyez que votre séjour va etre bénéfique pour vous?

S3 Oui oui très bénéfice pour moi pour perfecter ma langue français et uh (coughs) pour connu la culture et uh uh (-) la France en général

T D'accord oui (-) est-ce que vous avez déjà travaillé?

S3 Uh oui uh j'ai un petite travail j'a travaillé dans le le (-) bureau et uh j'ai dû prendre les messages au téléphone et j'ai dû prendre les uh (-) le thé et uh uh j'ai dû prendre les documents dans la fiche le fichier et (-) uh beaucoup de choses

T Et est-ce que vous travaillez avec le public dans ce travail?

S3 Ah oui uh uh (coughs) uh (- -) il y a les clients uh (-) et j'ai dû prendre les messages pour le téléphone et uh je trouve uh je crois uh que les clients voudraient

T Et en général est-ce que vous aimez travailler avec le public?

S3 Oui j'ai travaillé dans cette bureau pour (- -) l'été pour deux ans et c'est très bénéfice

T Très bien (-) est-ce que vous pouvez me décrire votre école secondaire?

S3 Uh (- -) l'école secondaire (- -) uh j'ai uh j'ai uh j'ai venue à l'école à Kildare et il y a huit sujets et dans le *Leaving Certificate* et uh il y a beaucoup des professeurs (-) et uh il y a le uh (-) *day* (laughs) le journée est très longue (-) pour uh auprès uh huit heures au quatorze quatre heures c'est uh c'est uh mais uh c'est d'accord

57 T Oui quel est votre avis sur votre école secondaire?
58 S3 Je préfère cette école parce que les professeurs est
59 très gentils et il n'y a beaucoup de sujets dans l'école et
60 uh uh (laughs) (- -) le journée n'est pas très longue et
61 (-) mais il y a beaucoup des voyagers à Dublin parce que
62 j'habite à Kildare et uh (-) je (-) je prends le
63 train chaque matin
64 T D'accord voilà voilà (- -) Quelle école est-ce que vous
65 aimez mieux? Vous aimez l'école ici ou votre école
66 secondaire?
67 S3 J'aimerais cette école *because* (- -) parce que uh
68 je voudrais prendre (-) j'étais à l'école (- -)
69 je voudrais devenir (- -) un (- -) information (- -)
70 bilingue et maintenant je suis content
71 T D'accord (-) voilà (-) je vous remercie
72 S3 Merci (-) merci Monsieur

Stage One, Subject 3 - Introspection

Transcription of a tape-recorded interview between the researcher (JR) and Subject 3 (S3).

1 JR Now when you were speaking French just now what was your
2 biggest problem?
3 S3 Uh (-) just that (-) it was OK there because I was on my
4 own (-) like I didn't feel conscious of other people
5 but when I'm in class I feel other people are better than
6 me and they sometimes might put me down because they
7 are better than me
8 JR So you were on your own just now and no-one was judging you
9 did you have any difficulties then? and what were they?
10 S3 Sorry?
11 JR What were your difficulties just now?
12 S3 Well I was fine there I thought (-) like sometimes I'm
13 thinking of the correct verb to use
14 JR Do you mean the verb or the noun?
15 S3 The verb
16 JR You didn't have any problems with any nouns then?
17 S3 No
18 JR OK the correct verb so what about the vocabulary then?
19 What do you do in that situation?
20 S3 Quickly try and think of another word that will give the

21		same meaning but it's not correct (-) it will give the
22		same meaning but it's not the verb I'm looking for
23	JR	Do you ever find yourself giving up and thinking I won't
24		mention that because it's not the verb I'm looking for?
25	S3	Sometimes but I always try (-) it doesn't always work
26		but I try (laughs)
27	JR	What do you think about your accent? Are you conscious
28		about that?
29	S3	Yeah my accent is flat definitely flat
30		(-) well I've not been able to test my
31		French with French people (-) my cousin was at home
32		for three months and I was able to hold a conversation
33		with him I knew the grammar was wrong but I corrected
34		myself and it was helpful
35	JR	To go back to the question of nouns and verbs you think
36		you have more problems with verbs?
37	S3	Tenses
38	JR	What about the endings and the agreements?
39	S3	Like *nous venons*?
40	JR	Yes
41	S3	They're OK (-) it's tenses though when to use the conditional
42		and the imperfect (-) the present and the past they're fine
43	JR	And you'd avoid the subjunctive?
44	S3	Yes
45	JR	But suppose in French class the teacher asks you a
46		question and you don't know the word for it what do
47		you do then?
48	S3	Uh (-) I'd stumble through it find another one
49	JR	Do you tell yourself at all I must keep going?
50	S3	Oh yes
51	JR	And did anyone tell you to do that?
52	S3	Yes I was told in French for the oral for the Leaving
53		Cert. but I tell myself as well
54	JR	Do you think you have any favourite phrases that you
55		use in French?
56	S3	*Je voudrais bien* I use that a lot I know I do
57	JR	Did you think you used it today?
58	S3	No
59	JR	Do you use any others?
60	S3	*Et puis* yes *et puis*
61	JR	Good thank you

Stage One, Subject 4 - Interview

Transcription of a tape-recorded interview between the tester (T) and Subject 4 (S4).

1	T	Bonjour
2	S4	Bonjour
3	T	Est-ce que vous pouvez me raconter ce que vous avez fait cette
4		année pendant vos classes (-) à l'école?
5	S4	A l'école? Tous les classes?
6	T	Oui
7	S4	Et oui (-) je fais j'ai fait le français commercial et (-)
8		dans ce classe uh nous faisons des lettres commerciales et
9		(- -) des conversations téléphoniques (- -) et dans les
10		classes uh commercial anglais uh nous faisons les lettres
11		commercials et (-) dans le le classe sténodactylographie
12		uh (- -) nous faisons beaucoup de des lettres commerciales et
13		des conversations (-) et dans uh (-) uh les ordinateurs
14		nous faisons (- -) le traitement des textes
15	T	D'accord très bien euh est-ce que vous pouvez me dire comment
16		vous venez à l'école le matin?
17	S4	Uh uh ou uh (- -) je (- -) *walk* (-) je (- -) *walk* uh
18		je prom (-) je me promener (- -) avec un ami une amie
19		(laughs) uh c'est vingt minutes parce que j'habite à Leeson Park
20	T	Bon d'accord (-) je crois que vous partez en France c'est vrai?
21	S4	Oui
22	T	Et où est-ce que vous allez exactement?
23	S4	Je ne sais pas encore parce que un ami de mon père uh il
24		dit que il il (- -) organise un travail pour moi
25	T	Oui d'accord Et qu'est-ce que vous attendez de votre
26		séjour en France?
27	S4	(- -) Je ne comprends
28	T	Euh est-ce que vous croyez que votre séjour va être bénéfique?
29	S4	Oui parce que uh (- -) je vais améliorer mon mon
30		français et je vais savoir beaucoup sur les france sur
31		les français
32	T	Très bien est-ce que vous avez déjà travaillé?
33	S4	Oui j'ai travaillé dans un hôtel
34	T	Où ça?
35	S4	A Courtown
36	T	Et pendant combien de temps?
37	S4	Deux ans
38	T	Et est-ce que vous avez aimé ce travail?

39	S4	Oui
40	T	Pourquoi?
41	S4	Parce que uh (-) uh les gens qui je travaille avec (- -)
42		uh (coughs) ils sont très (-) *sympathetic* et uh
43		(-) je rencontrais beaucoup de gens aussi et (- -)
44	T	Est-ce que vous aimez travailler avec le public?
45	S4	Oui
46	T	Pourquoi?
47	S4	Parce que uh (-) il est beaucoup de différents gens et
48		c'est bon pour moi
49	T	Pouvez-vous me décrire votre école secondaire?
50	S4	(-) uh oui uh c'est (- -) c'est petit c'est c'est (- -)
51		uh (- -) uh (- -) uh c'est à la Gorey c'est quatre kilo-
52		mètres de moi et je (- -) il n'y a pas beaucoup de gens ici
53		parce que c'est un petit village (- -) uh c'est (- -) uh
54		(laughs)
55	T	Bon est-ce que vous pouvez me dire est-ce que vous aimez
56		mieux notre école ici ou est-ce que vous aimez mieux votre
57		école secondaire?
58	S4	J'aimerais mieux mon école secondaire parce que uh je sais
59		les gens ici pour cinq ans (-) et quand j'ai venue ici
60		(- -) uh (- -) mon mon amie mes amies c'est autre place
61	T	Eh bien je vous remercie
62	S4	je vous prie (laughs)

Stage One, Subject 4 — Introspection

Transcription of a tape-recorded interview between the researcher (JR) and Subject 4 (S4).

1	JR	What do you find most difficult about speaking French?
2	S4	I find it difficult because I'm not very confident
3		about the verbs the tenses and if I get any of them
4		wrong I have to go back and repeat them and then I get
5		all mixed up or whatever
6	JR	What do you mean by get them wrong?
7	S4	Well if I go in the wrong tense and I get my tenses
8		mixed up then I go back and I correct them and I get
9		them right
10	JR	Do you ever find that the right word is hard to find?
11	S4	Yes I go blank
12	JR	If for instance you wanted a word just now - say post-office?

13 S4 I can't think of it now at all
14 JR But it's a word you've had before?
15 S4 Yes
16 JR You'd say it in English, do you do that?
17 S4 Yes (laughs)
18 JR Do you ever think of another word that might do?
19 S4 Yes and then I forget the one that might have been
20 right and then I go blank (-) I sometimes do that in
21 English
22 JR You mean you have memory lapses in English?
23 S4 Yes (laughs)
24 JR In normal conversations or when you're under a bit
25 of pressure like you are now?
26 S4 No I think it's when I'm under a bit of pressure
27 JR Do you ever hear yourself making a mistake?
28 S4 Uh yes
29 JR What do you do then?
30 S4 Well I kind of go back and do it right whereas I should
31 really go on but I go back and correct it
32 JR And if you don't know the right word do you take the
33 risk and try and say it in French?
34 S4 Sometimes I don't always go for the English word
35 JR Do you ever avoid saying something altogether because
36 you don't know the word?
37 S4 Yes I do (laughs)
38 JR Are you afraid of making a mistake then in French?
39 S4 Yes I am
40 JR What do you think of your accent?
41 S4 Uh I think it's OK like we didn't really use it in
42 school very much (-) I think it's improved a lot since
43 I came here
44 JR Are you conscious of putting on a French accent when
45 you're speaking?
46 S4 No I don't think so
47 JR Who are you imitating? Are you imitating Monsieur
48 B. [the teacher] for example?
49 S4 No I don't think so (-) Maybe some of the girls in the
50 class that can speak it properly like they roll their
51 'r's or whatever you know
52 JR So to sum up you find verbs the most difficult thing
53 any other problems?
54 S4 Well apart from going blank (laughs)

55	JR	Going blank is a problem?
56	S4	Yes (laughs)

Stage Two, Subject 1 - Interview

Transcription of a tape-recorded interview between the tester (T) and Subject 1 (S1).

1	T	Bonjour
2	S1	Bonjour Monsieur
3	T	Vous êtes de retour de France n'est-ce pas?
4	S1	Oui
5	T	Et combien de temps avez-vous passé en France?
6	S1	Oh j'ai passé six mois en France
7	T	Ah bon et où ça?
8	S1	Oh d'abord c'était à Toulon et puis près (-) au mois
9		d'aoûst (- -) et puis c'était à Paris
10	T	Ah bon parlons d'abord de Toulon
11	S1	Oh (- -) j'ai commencé comme jeune fille au pair
12	T	Oui
13	S1	Et uh (- -) mais je devais passer tout le temps sur la
14		plage avec les enfants
15	T	Oui
16	S1	Et le père il était marin et il était toujours au mer
17	T	Bon
18	S1	Oui et la mère (- -) elle était (-) quoi
19		(- -) jamais à la maison (-) et moi j'ai (- -) si je n'étais pas
20		avec les enfants sur la plage j'étais toute seule dans la
21		maison avec les enfants
		(interview interrupted)
22	S1	(- -) j'ai oublié (laughs)
23	T	Donc vous étiez toute seule sur la plage
24	S1	Oui et uh (-) il faisait très chaud et uh j'étais avec les
25		enfants et je (-) je j'ai uh je n'ai rien appris
26	T	Ah bon
27	S1	Et uh elle m'a donné pratiquement rien pour manger
28	T	Vraiment c'est un scandale
29	S1	Oui (laughs) et après quatre semaines j'ai
30		decidé de quitter
31	T	Ah bon mais quelles étaient vos responsabilités à la maison?
32	S1	Ce que j'ai fait?

33	T	Oui
34	S1	Oh (- -) à Toulon (-) je n'ai fait absolument rien (-)
35		sauf j'ai j'ai fait tout pour les enfants
36		je n'ai pas fait de ménage
37	T	C'est à dire ?
38	S1	Oh j'ai changé les couches
39	T	Ah bon vous avez changé les couches
40	S1	Oui (-) et j'ai donné le bain
41	T	Vous avez changé les couches est-ce que vous les
42		avez achetées ?
43	S1	Ah non (-) ils étaient toujours là (-)
44		la mère (- -) ils étaient là
45	T	Ah bon d'accord. Et est-ce que vous pourriez me dire
46		comment vous avez changé les couches?
47	S1	(-) Ah oui (-) je mets l'enfant sur la table (-) allongé
48		sur la table et (- -) bon je ne sais pas (laughs) il faut
49		deviner qu'est-ce qu'il y a dedans (laughs)
50	T	Oui bien sûr
51	S1	Et il y a des choses à gauche et à droite (-) et il faut
52		enlever il y a comme le plastique (-) comme du Scotch
53	T	Ah oui
54	S1	Et il faut les enlever et (-) il faut nettoyer le bébé
55	T	Bon et euh avec quoi est-ce que vous nettoyez le bébé?
56	S1	Du coton
57	T	Du coton et?
58	S1	Et uh (- -) ça dépend (- -) ça pour les enfants (-)
59		si ce n'est trop sale on met de l'eau
60	T	De l'eau oui
61	S1	Et de l'eau spécifique pour les enfants
62	T	De l'eau spécifique qu'est-ce que c'est?
63	S1	(laughs) c'est de la crème
64	T	Ah bon
65	S1	Et on le met (-) sur l'enfant après et si c'est rouge
66		(-) puis on met une autre couche
67	T	Si quoi est rouge ?
68	S1	Le postérieur
69	T	D'accord oui (-) et si c'est rouge qu'est-ce que le bébé a?
70	S1	Uh (- -) il a du mal
71	T	Mais quelle maladie ce n'est pas vraiment une maladie
72		quelle est la condition?
73	S1	Oh (-) s'il est tout rouge c'est uh (- -) comme une
74		irritation

75	T	Très bien (-) Alors parlons de Paris vous étiez jeune
76		fille au pair à Paris aussi?
77	S1	Oui mai j'ai passé d'abord trois semaines dans une
78		maison pour les vieillards
79	T	Ah bon et qu'est-ce que vous avez fait là?
80	S1	Oh j'ai aidé le chef et j'ai preparé les repas
81	T	Bon
82	S1	Et j'ai travaillé comme serveuse
83	T	Et quel était le titre exacte de vos fonctions?
84	S1	Une (- -) cuisinière
85	T	D'accord et qu'est-ce que vous avez cuisiné alors?
86	S1	Bon (-) c'était je devais préparer les
87		pommes de terre (-)
88		éplucher les pommes de terre (-) et j'ai
89		préparé les carottes
90	T	Et avec quoi avez-vous epluché les pommes de terre?
90	S1	(- -) Un couteau
91	T	D'accord (-) alors il n'y avait pas d'instrument spécifique?
93	S1	Non
94	T	Et les carottes comment avez-vous fait ça?
95	S1	Oh (-) je les ai epluchées je les ai mis dans un (- -)
96		instrument (-) c'était un (-) mixer
97	T	Oui oui
98	S1	Et c'était (- -) il faut appuyer sur le bouton du mixer
99		et uh (-) ils sont préparés par cette méthode
100	T	Ah bon d'accord (-) et combien de repas avez-vous
101		fait par jour?
102	S1	Deux simplement
103	T	Deux
104	S1	Oui le repas du midi et le repas du soir
105	T	Ah bon (-) et avez-vous trouvé les menus différents par
106		rapport à l'Irlande?
107	S1	Oui (-) pas simplement la recette (-) mais la manière
108		pour manger
109	T	Pourriez-vous me décrire un petit peu?
110	S1	Oui (-) comme par example en Irlande on met tout sur
111		l'assiette uh les légumes le la viande (-) et en France (-)
112		en général il y a un grand (- -) une grande boîte (-) une
113		grande présentation au milieu de la table (-) une
114		grande assiette (-) et c'est uh avec les (-) une pour les
115		carottes mais c'est la présentation (-) et à coté il y a les
116		assiettes et si on veut on sert les carottes (-)

117		et on mange comme ça en France
118	T	D'accord
119	S1	Et chez moi dans la famille à Versailles j'ai mangé une
120		assiette de pommes de terre (laughs) et puis une assiette
121		de carottes (laughs) et puis une assiette de viande (-)
122		et moi j'ai trouvé que j'ai mangé beaucoup plus qu'ici
123	T	Ah bon tiens tiens
124	S1	Oui (laughs) parce qu'en Irlande on met tout sur l'assiette et
125		c'est tout (-) et je prends le deuxième et le
126		troisième (laughs)
127	T	D'accord oui (-) et avez-vous fait la sauce pour la
128		salade?
129	S1	(-) C'était toujours dans une bouteille
130	T	C'était toujours dans une bouteille?
131	S1	Oui (laughs)
132	T	Tiens
133	S1	La sauce pour la salade?
134	T	Oui la sauce pour la salade vous n'avez pas préparé vous-même?
135	S1	Non (-) c'était toujours déjà fait
136	T	Ah bon
137	S1	(-) Et il y avait un chef aussi oui il y avait un chef de
138		cuisine et moi j'étais avec un autre homme qui était espagnol
139	T	Ah oui
140	S1	Un peu uh (- -) un peu folle
141	T	Folle? Tiens
142	S1	Oui il était folle
143	T	Tiens (-) et vos autres responsabilités vous avez préparé
144		les repas et c'est tout?
145	S1	Oui j'ai travaillé comme serveuse (-) et j'ai aidé (- -) il y
146		avait une personne qui ne peut pas couper
147	T	Oui
148	S1	Oui couper la viande
149	T	Ah bon
150	S1	Oui (- -) et c'était tout
151	T	D'accord (-) et vous avez dit que vous avez mis les carottes
152		dans une machine c'est vrai?
153	S1	Oui
154	T	Alors est-ce que vous pouvez décrire un petit peu alors
155		décrivez la machine et comment elle marchait
156	S1	Ah (-) c'était une machine (- -) uh (- -)
157		c'était simple à faire c'était un mixer
158	T	Oui

159	S1	Et uh (- -) uh (-) il faut toujours brancher (-) on peut
160		faire beaucoup de choses les salades et pour (-)
161		pour les carottes
162		on met (-) uh (- -) un appareil de plastique
163		uh (-) sur l'appareil électrique
164	T	Oui
165	S1	Et uh (-) vous ajoutez la salade et uh (-) on
166		entend un clic
167	T	Oui
168	S1	Et il faut ajouter les carottes
169	T	Comment s'appelle cet appareil plastique?
170	S1	La plastique?
171	T	Oui
172	S1	Je ne sais pas
173	T	Ah bon (-) et est-ce que la machine est toujours branchée?
174	S1	Oui tout le temps
175	T	Et où est-ce qu'il faut la brancher?
176	S1	(- -) uh (- -) j'ai oublié (-) dans le (- -)
177	T	Dans le?
178	S1	(-) Il y a un bouton et deux trous
179	T	Deux trous oui
180	S1	Deux trous oui (-) et à (- -) à la fin de la
181		corde de la corde électrique (-) le fil
182		(laughs) uh il y a un truc (- -) j'ai oublié
183	T	Bon d'accord
184	S1	Il faut appuyer sur quelque chose et il marche (-)
185		il y a quelque chose pour protéger les mains
186		parce que sinon on va les râper
187	T	(laughs)
188	S1	Et il faut appuyer ça et c'est très simple à
189		utiliser
190	T	Très facile à utiliser
191	S1	Oui
192	T	Et qu'est-ce que la machine que fait-elle aux
193		carottes exactement?
194	S1	Ah (-) uh (- -) il y a quelque chose qui est
195		très uh (- -) il y a un grand couteau (-) un
196		grand couteau (-) un grand couteau pour couper (-)
197		il y a deux parties (- -) et la carotte devient
198		coupée
199	T	Oui
200	S1	Et uh (-) à la fin (-) on voit les carottes elles

201		sont dans les petites (- -) lignes (-) et ça
202		marche comme ça
203	T	Bon d'accord (- -) et vous avez fini votre travail
204		dans cet hospice de vieillards?
205	S1	Oui après trois semaines parce que (-) j'ai trouvé
206		une autre un autre emploi comme jeune fille au pair et
207		c'était pendant le mois d'août
208	T	Ah bon d'accord voilà je vous remercie beaucoup
209	S1	De rien Monsieur

Stage Two, Subject 2 - Interview

Transcription of a tape-recorded interview between the tester (T) and Subject 2 (S2).

1	T	Bonjour
2	S2	Bonjour Monsieur
3	T	Et alors vous êtes partie en France et euh vous
4		vous êtes restée combien de temps là?
5	S2	Oui j'ai resté six mois
6	T	Ah bon
7	S2	A Bordeaux
8	T	Ah bon
9	S2	Dans le sud dans le sud-ouest
10	T	Et la vie vous a plu?
11	S2	Ah oui
12	T	Pourquoi donc?
13	S2	Oh (-) c'était superbe c'était très différent de
14		Dublin
15	T	Oui
16	S2	Oui (-) euh c'est: c'est: plus grand (-) il y a
17		beaucoup de: (-) monuments de la guerre qui marquent la
18		guerre et tous les choses comme ça (-) euh tout le style de
19		la vie (- -) les parcs les magasins et tous les choses
20		comme ça c'est très différent
21	T	Oui d'accord oui (- -) Et les monuments de la guerre
22		c'était un choc?
23	S2	Oh (- -) non
24	T	Pas tellement?
25	S2	Non
26	T	Mais c'est tellement différent par rapport à
27		l'Irlande n'est-ce pas?

28	S2	Oui oui oui
29	T	Oui (-) Et les français en général?
30	S2	Euh: euh: ils sont sympas euh (-) moi j'ai eu de la
31		chance parce que j'étais avec (-) avec un bon famille
32		très sympa le père il: était un (- -) peu bizarre (-)
33		il n'a parlé pas du tout mais: c'était juste lui je crois
34	T	Ah bon
35	S2	Euh les gens sont sympas (-) ils parlent avec les autres
36		les étrangers et si si on ne parle pas le français c'est
37		pas (- -) un (tsk) comment on dit (tsk) c'est: ça
38		va parce que ils parlent un peu de l'anglais pour vous
39		aider et: on ne parle pas le francais et on peut
40		traduire et les choses comme ça
41	T	Oui oui (-) euh est-ce que vous avez trouvé les
42		formalités françaises différentes je veux dire le rythme social
43	S2	Euh: c'est toujours le de (-) de (-) le travail on (- -)
44		quand on se lève le matin (-) bon on mange j'ai trouvé
45		ça on mange tout le temps (laughs) donc on mange on
46		travaille c'est toujours comme ça (-) dans ma (-)
47		dans ma famille c'était comme ça (- -) le père travaille le
48		matin jusqu'au à huit heures huit heures et demie
49		le soir (-) et après cela c'est juste une demi-heure
50		avec les enfants (-) et ça c'était toute (- -) avec
51		les enfants bon et tout ça et (- -) je trouve
52		que c'était lui (- -) oui euh c'était lui c'était
53		toujours avec les conversations de l'entreprise le
54		travail les affaires et tous les choses comme ça
55	T	Oui d'accord oui (-) et comment avez-vous trouvé
56		la nourriture française?
57	S2	Oh (laughs) (- -) (laughs) terrible
58	T	Terrible
59	S2	Oui terrible (-) je n'aimais pas du tout
60	T	Pourquoi?
61	S2	Parce qu'ici je ne mange pas beaucoup ici je ne mange
62		pas les légumes (-) et moi j'adore le chocolat des chocolats
63		les glaces et tous les choses comme ça et euh (-)
64		c'était ça va pour moi parce que quand j'ai gardé
65		les enfants
66	T	Oui
67	S2	Il y avait le frigidaire avec euh: tous les choses comme
68		ça et (- -) c'était pas problème mais euh j'ai commencé de:
69		manger les choses français comme (-) je ne sais pas (-)

70		tous les plats comme euh: un rôti de porc et avec le
71		l'ail je n'aime pas ça (- -) mais c'était bon
72	T	Et le pâté
73	S2	Pâté?
74	T	Vous avez aimé le pâté?
75	S2	(- -) C'est uh c'est comme le viande et
76	T	Oui
77	S2	Oui oui oui sur le pain les baguettes
78	T	Oui
79	S2	C'était (-) ça va un peu (- -) un peu: un peu de graisse
80	T	Oui
81	S2	Oui je n'aime pas ça un peu de graisse mais (- -)
82	T	D'accord oui (-) alors quelles étaient vos responsabilités
83		quand vous étiez dans cette famille?
84	S2	Bon j'ai gardé les enfants euh: j'ai fait euh: des j'ai
85		fait des repas je l'ai baigné euh: j'ai gardé les
86		chambres propres (- -) je les ai habillés j'ai repassé
87		(-) en tout ce que (-) uh (-) en tout ce qu'il y a
88		de faire avec les enfants je (-) je l'ai fait (-)
89		uh (- -) je les ai amusés beaucoup
90	T	Et quelle est votre opinion de ce travail?
91	S2	Euh: (- -) c'est très fatigant (- -) on on se lève
92		euh: à sept heures et demie huit heures et on finit euh:
93		quoi (- -) c'est huit heures le: (- -) soir (-) sinon
94		plus c'est c'est très fatigant c'est euh: (- -) il y a
95		beaucoup de responsa responsabilités (- -) avec
96		les enfants (-) les petites (- -) mais euh mais bon
97		bon j'avais de la chance j'avais (- -) euh (- -)
98		deux enfants deux petites filles mais euh: elles étaient
99		sympas et tout ça
100	T	Oui (- -) vous avez dit vous avez repassé c'est ça?
101	S2	Oui
102	T	Et avec quoi avez-vous repassé?
103	S2	Un fer (laughs)
104	T	Un fer bon
105	S2	(laughs) Oui
106	T	Ah bon et est-ce que vous vous souvenez de la marque?
107	S2	Uh (- -) non (-) non non non
108	T	Et pourriez-vous m'indiquer comment vous faisiez
109		pour faire marcher le fer?
110	S2	(laughs) Euh: bon euh: (- -) on branche (-) on on met
111		de l'eau (- -) dedans (- -) on attend euh jusqu'au

112	T	Pardon on met de l'eau dans quoi?
113	S2	Oh pardon on met de l'eau dans (-) il y a un petit
114		trou dans le fer
115	T	Oui
116	S2	Et euh dans le fer on met on met de l'eau dans dedans
117		(- -) on attend il y a une lumière rouge qui s'allume
118		(- -) on attend ça puis le fer est prête l'eau euh: est chaud
119		(- -) puis on: il y a un bouton pour choisir le coton le
120		laine et les choses comme ça (- -) ça dépend sur euh les
121		choses que qu'on repasse (- -) on choisit et: puis on
122		repasse s'il y a un besoin de l'eau on euh il y a un
123		petit bouton qui on appuye et (- -) de l'eau qui
124		sort on repasse
125	T	Mais elle n'est pas bouchée l'eau n'est pas bouchée?
126	S2	L'eau est bouchée je ne comprends pas
127	T	Alors c'est-à-dire quand vous repassez est-ce que l'eau
128		peut sortir du trou ou
129	S2	Ah oui oui oui si on appuye sur le bouton donc s'il
130		y a un besoin de l'eau on appuye sur le bouton et
131		puis (- -) il y a de l'eau
132	T	Et qu'est-ce qui s'est produit?
133	S2	Il est de l'eau qui sort
134	T	De l'eau liquide?
135	S2	Oui oui (-) oui oui
136	T	Donc c'était un fer simple n'est-ce pas?
137	S2	Oui (laughs) oui
138	T	Oui
139	S2	Bon oui c'est uh (-) je crois que tous les fers sont
140		comme ça
141	T	Oui mais enfin il y a
142	S2	Oui chez moi oui
143	T	Voilà (- -) vous avez dit que vous avez branché
144		le feu mais où est-ce que vous avez branché?
145	S2	Euh: (- -) uh c'était uh (- -) quel est le mot (- -)
146		(- -) le trou (laughs) uh (- -) sur le mur (laughs)
147	T	Oui d'accord
148	S2	J'ai oublié le mot
149	T	D'accord alors vous avez dit que vous avez amusé les
150		enfants que vous avez joué avec les enfants
151	S2	Oui
152	T	Alors pourriez-vous me donner quelques examples des jeux?
153	S2	Euh euh c'était beaucoup de (-) beaucoup des puzzles

154		euh j'avais un enfant de quatre ans (-) et elle a
155		fait beaucoup de puzzles (-) bon avec les grands morceaux
156	T	Oui
157	S2	Il y avait un lapin c'était très sympa un grand lapin
158		et quoi je crois quinze ou vingt morceaux (-) et
159		ils ont les grands blocs comme ça (indicates with hands)
160		et on a fait ça tout le temps euh: et aussi (- -)
161		c'était quoi (- -) alors les choses pour faire les colliers
162	T	Qu'est-ce que c'est exactement?
163	S2	C'est les (- -) (laughs) les colliers c'est les choses
164		qu'on met uh pour le (-) (indicates neck)
165	T	Oui je sais mais
166	S2	Oui mais c'est c'est pour le (-) le cou
167	T	Oui mais de quoi se compose
168	S2	C'est
169	T	C'est quoi ?
170	S2	C'est les petits morceaux de bois
171		Oui et: on met sur uh sur une ligne avec un avec une
172		aiguille
173	T	Oui
174	S2	Et on peut on peut mettre (-) euh beaucoup de couleurs
175		beaucoup de couleurs euh (- -) et les choses en rouge et
176		puis les choses en bleu et les choses comme ça
177	T	C'était amusant
178	S2	Oui (- -) et pour la petite Marie-Alix elle avait un
179		grand camion (-) mais (- -) c'était
180	T	(laughs)
181	S2	Mais c'était (- -) il y avait une une ligne et j'ai tiré
182		tout le temps et elle dedans et ça c'était sur le
183		balcon le terrasse c'était
184	T	C'était un petit camion?
185	S2	Oh c'était juste il n'y avait pas le (-) un (-) un
186		devant (-) il y avait juste la derrière d'un camion
187	T	Alors ce n'était pas un camion spécifique
188	S2	Non non (-) non non (- -) non non
189	T	D'accord (-) Vous les sortiez jamais les enfants
190	S2	Euh: (-) Oui mais pas beaucoup parce que (-) la
191		maison c'était euh: située dans la rue principe et c'était
192		très dangereuse (-) le père il était (- -) très uh (- -)
193		comment on dit (- -) il euh n'aime euh il n'aime il
194		n'aimait pas quand j'ai (-) je suis sortie avec les
195		enfants parce que (-) je il y avait uh une dans la

196		poussette et l'autre (- -) elle a tiré sur la poussette
197		et uh il y avait beaucoup de (-) de rues de traverser
198		mais le parc uh le parc Bordelais
199	T	Oui
200	S2	C'était un peu loin mais ça va dans l'autobus
201		(-) et moi je suis (-) je suis là quoi cinque ou six
202		fois avec les enfants
203	T	Vous avez dit que le père n'aimait pas ça à
204		cause de la rue principale?
205	S2	Non (- -) bon avec des voitures si la voiture écrase
206		(laughs) bon c'est (- -) les je crois que les français
207		conduit conduisent uh très vite et euh et euh c'est
208		affreux
209	T	Oui
210	S2	Parce que j'étais sur toutes les autoroutes (-) sur
211		deux autoroutes et j'ai vu beaucoup des accidents aussi
212		(- -) et c'était térrible
213	T	Oui oui bien sur oui voilà (- -) Et qu'est-ce que
214		(-) quand un conducteur il traverse un village comme ça
215		s'il voit les enfants sur la route qu'est-ce qu'il
216		est obligé de faire tout de suite?
217	S2	(- -) Le conducteur?
218	T	Oui le conducteur oui
219	S2	Mais il faut s'arrêter
220	T	Oui il faut s'arrêter bien sûr
221	S2	(laughs)
222	T	Eh bien mademoiselle merci beaucoup
223	S2	Mais je vous en prie

Stage Two, Subject 3 - Interview

Transcription of a tape-recorded interview between the tester (T) and Subject 3 (S.3).

1	T	Bonjour
2	S3	Bonjour Monsieur
3	T	Vous êtes de retour de France pourriez-vous me
4		raconter qu'est-ce que vous avez fait là-bas?
5	S3	Pendant les six mois?
6	T	Oui
7	S3	De l'expérience d'accord (- -) uh je suis allée
8		au Bruxelles en Belgique mais je suis le seule personne

qui est allée au Belgique
T Oui
S3 Et uh (- -) j'ai j'ai eu deux familles (-) et avec la première famille pour (-) uh deux mois après deux mois j'ai trouvé un autre famille en Bruxelles aussi (-) et on a et pour le mois juillet j'ai je suis allée en France et uh (-) au Bretagne et à Brest (-) à Brest aussi (-) et on a et pour le mois juillet j'ai je suis restée au (-) Bretagne (-) et pour le mois d'août je suis restée uh (-) en Nantes (-) parce que la famille avait un grand maison avec une piscine (-) et tous les choses come ça et uh (- -) puis à la fin de mois d'août uh je suis revenue au Bruxelles et (-) j'ai trouvé une autre famille et uh (- -) j'ai répondu j'ai répondu à une petite annonce dans un journeaux (- -) et je suis allée dans un autre famille uh uh il y a une (-) fille très sage très sage très gentille uh mais (-) la première famille les garçons (-) uh et les deux garçons (-) oh je déteste les
T Ah bon
S3 Oui les deux garçons (- -) *ugh* (laughs)
T Tiens (laughs)
S3 Oui et Jérome et Richard Jérome était maintenant uh cinq ans et demi (-) et uh Richard deux ans ou presque et (- -) ils sont (- -) monstres monstres affreux affreux (- -) et uh (-) pour la première semaine en septembre (-) je suis rentrée à mon maison pour (-) une semaine et c'est une surprise pour ma mère et mon père et uh (- -) ma tante est allée au l'aéroport pour ramasser et uh (- -) et uh (- -) puis après la semaine je suis revenue au uh en Bruxelles pour un autre quatre mois et uh (-) et puis (- -) oh c'est le meilleurs six mois dans tout ma vie
T Ah bon (- -) parlons de cette première famille avec ces garçons si terribles
S3 Oh les garçons
T Quelles étaient vos responsabilités exactement?
S3 Uh avec les garçons les garçons (- -) les garçons sont tout (- -) je n'ai pas fait le travail de ménage et uh (-) mais j'ai changé les couches tout le temps et avec uh pour Richard qui a deux ans et uh (- -) les couches quatre fois par jour

51 T Ah oui
52 S3 Oui et quelquefois pendant la nuit aussi
53 T Ah bon
54 S3 Et aussi si Richard criait uh dans la nuit pendant
55 la nuit et j'ai changé les biberons et les couches
56 pendant la nuit (- -) c'était très très dur Richard
57 T Si vous permettez parlons des biberons est-ce que c'est
58 vous qui a préparé les biberons?
59 S3 Oui les biberons quelquefois oui
60 T Et pourriez-vous me raconter comment vous préparez un biberon?
61 S3 Oui mais uh de lait (-) j'ai j'ai ouvert le biberon et
62 metté le lait dans le biberon et quelquefois uh j'ai
63 metté les vitamines dans le biberon aussi
64 T Ah bon
65 S3 Oui pour Richard
66 T Le lait est froid ou chaid?
67 S3 Oh pendant le jour pour le jour le lait froid mais
68 pour la nuit le lait chaud
69 T Et d'où venait ce lait chaud alors?
70 S3 Uh de lait chaud j'ai pris de lait chaud uh (- -)
71 sur le four (-) et c'est facile (laughs)
72 T Oui mais racontez-moi du début ce que vous avez fait là
73 S3 Comment préparer un biberon?
74 T Oui pour faire chauffer du lait
77 S3 Oh d'accord (- -) la première chose uh j'ai trouvé le
78 lait j'ai trouvé le lait dans le (-) [fɪɪdʒoɷ]
79 T Oui
80 S3 Et metté le lait le lait dans le (-) [kwioɷ]
81 uh et uh metté sur le four
82 T Vous avez mis le lait où où ça?
83 S3 Oh metté sur le four
84 T Oui
85 S3 Et (- -) et puis (- -) assurez-vous que le four est branché
86 T Bien sur oui
87 S3 Et uh (-)
88 T Et le four il faut le brancher où?
89 S3 Ou uh la bouche (-) uh (-) le bouchon (- -) et
90 puis vous mettez uh (- -) le [bujoɷ] sur le
91 feu et uh prendre le lait et puis (-) vous mettez
92 de l'eau de lait dans le biberon
93 T Oui je vous demande pardon mais le four doit être branché
94 mais il doit être branché où?

95	S3	Uh sur le bouchon et le bouchon est habituellement
96		uh au le mur
97	T	Oui d'accord oui d'accord (-) et puis le lait vous
98		ne mettez euh: pas sur le four directement?
99	S3	(- -) Pardon?
100	T	On parle du lait
101	S3	Oui oui
102	T	Vous avez dit que vous cherchez le lait dans le frigo
103		et vous mettez le lait où exactement?
104	S3	Uh (- -) dans un grand uh (- -) [buwoɷ]
105	T	Ah oui d'accord oui d'accord très bien voilà (- -)
106		et parlons des couches encore une fois (-) est-ce que
107		vous avez acheté les couches?
108	S3	Non les parents ont acheté les couches tout le temps
109	T	Et est-ce que vous pouvez me raconter exactement comment
110		vous faisiez pour changer les couches?
111	S3	Uh (- -) mais quand Richard était sale
112	T	Est-ce que vous pouvez me raconter exactement comment
113		vous faisiez pour changer les couches?
114	S3	Uh j'ai mis Richard sur un table ou sur un lit (-)
115		et uh j'ai trouvé un nouveau couche (-) et uh et (-)
116		et puis uh (-) j'ai le sale couche le couche sale dans
117		la poubelle et avec avec le nouvelle (-) uh (-)
118		couche (-) uh j'ai attaché les autocolliants (-)
119		uh au les deux côtés de la couche (-) et uh puis
120		remonter les culottes de Richard
121	T	Oui d'accord oui (- -) et vous n'aviez pas de ménage
122		à faire?
123	S3	Non (- -) rien
124	T	Alors c'était une famille formidable
125	S3	Oui avec les deux familles avec la première famille j'ai
126		fait de ménage (-) mais la deuxième fois et j'ai eu un
127		appartement dans le sous-sol et le famille habitait
128		sur le rez-de-chaussée et c'est parfait (laughs)
129	T	Ah c'est bien vous aviez donc votre propre
130		appartement c'est ça
131	S3	Oui un propre (-) avec quatre salles c'est bien
132	T	Vous étiez obligé de faire le ménage là non?
133	S3	Non (-) un petit peu mais (laughs)
134	T	Un petit peu
135	S3	*Yeah* mais
136	T	Pas beaucoup

137	S3	Pas beaucoup
138	T	D'accord OK très bien (- -) vous êtes allée en Bretagne
139		n'est-ce pas?
140	S3	Oui uh (-) pour juillet
141	T	Bon (-) et comment avez-vous trouvé Bretagne?
142	S3	Ah c'est la même comme Irlande
143	T	Oui?
144	S	Oui les champs et les arbres et le temps (-) le
145		temps est le mieux (laughs)
146	T	D'accord (laughs)
147	S3	Oui (laughs) oui
148	T	Et en général comment était la nourriture?
149	S3	La nourriture en Bretagne (- -) uh (- -) j'ai vu que les
150		personnes là ont mangé beaucoup de fromage (-)
151		mais c'est vrai pout tout le France mais en Bretagne
152		beaucoup mais du vin oh mon Dieu
153	T	Du vin
154	S3	Oui du vin rouge (laughs)
155	T	Oui (laughs)
156	S3	Oui oui (laughs)
157	T	Et quel type de vin rouge?
158	S3	Uh: (- -) habituellement c'était (- -) oh j'ai oublié
159		le nom oh (- -) c'était de vin de Bordeaux où il y
160		beaucoup de vin de Bordeaux
161	T	Ah oui vous l'avez goûté?
162	S3	Oh oui: bien sûr (laughs)
163	T	Et quel était le goût du vin?
164	S3	Oh c'était (- -) c'était très très bien uh j'ai bu j'ai
165		bu beaucoup de vin (laughs) et uh (-) quand je suis
166		rentrée à l'Irlande (- -) oh ma ligne *ugh* (laughs)
167	T	Ah bon (- -) et pourriez-vous décrire le goût du vin?
168	S3	Oh uh (- -) il y a beaucoup des vins et tous les vins sont
169		différents uh (-) mais j'aimerais tout et (-)
170		c'était difficile à expliquer parce que (- -)
171		je ne suis pas très sûr à le sujet mais (-)
172		les français connaissent bien (laughs)
173	T	D'accord oui (laughs) bon écoutez merci

Stage Two, Subject 4 - Interview

Transcription of a tape-recorded interview between the tester (T) and Subject 4 (S4).

1	T	Bonjour
2	S4	Bonjour Monsieur
3	T	Alors vous étiez en France c'est vrai (-) pendant l'été
4	S4	[bɛ] pour six mois
5	T	Et pourriez-vous me dire où vous avez été?
6	S4	[bɛ] moi j'étais dans un petit village qui s'appelle
7		Hierès-sur-Amby en Izère (-) c'était trentes kilomètres de Lyon
8	T	Ah bon et vous étiez dans une famille?
9	S4	Oui (-) ils étaient bien sympas il y avait deux enfants
10	T	Oui
11	S4	Une petite fille et un petit garçon
12	T	Qu'est-ce que les parents faisaient?
13	S4	Euh: la mère était secrétaire (-) dans une dans une
14		(-) abattoir de viande (-) puis le: le père il était travaillait
15		dans le même abattoir parce que son père il était
16		propriétaire de ce firme
17	T	Ah bon d'accord oui (-) et comme jeune fille au pair
18		quelles étaient vos responsabilités dans la famille?
19	S4	Bon alors (-) j'ai fait euh: (-) j'ai gardé les
20		petits enfants le matin
21	T	Oui
22	S4	J'ai fait j'ai fait le repassage j'ai: j'ai mis la table pour
23		le repas parce que la mère elle a amené le repas de l'abattoir
24	T	Ah bon
25	S4	Et puis après ça c'était (-) j'ai gardé les petits enfants
26		pour le: l'après-midi puis j'étais chez la grand-mère
27	T	D'accord oui (-) et vous avez dit que vous avez fait
28		le repassage?
29	S4	Oui c'est vrai
30	T	Pourriez-vous me décrire comment vous faisiez
31		exactement pour faire le repassage?
32	S4	Le repassage?
33	T	Oui
34	S4	Bon (-) il y avait la table pour faire le repassage
35	T	Oui
36	S4	Il y avait le fer
37	T	Oui
38	S4	Puis dans cette maison il y avait beaucoup de repassage

parce qu'elle a changé les vêtements des petits enfants tous les jours

T Oui

S4 (-) Alors euh vous voulez que:?

T Alors euh (-) qu'est-ce que vous faisiez comment ça marche le fer?

S4 Bon (-) [bɛ] j'ai branché le fer

T Et où est-ce que vous avez branché le fer?

S4 (- -) Bon dans le (- -) dans le mur dans le: dans la prise?

T Comment?

S4 Dans la prise

T Ah bon

S4 Et puis j'ai mis de l'eau là dedans (-) dans le fer (-) pour faire que ça (- -) ça (- -)

T Et avec quoi avez-vous mis de l'eau?

S4 (- -) Avec un: verre

T Avec un verre?

S4 [bɛ] (-) avec un verre (- -) j'ai mis l'eau dans le verre puis: il y avait une petite (-) lumière que s'éteind quand c'est prêt (-) quand il fait assez chaud pour repasser (- -) puis après ça: j'ai mis les vêtements sur la table

T Oui

S4 Et j'ai repassé

T Et quel type de fer (-) c'était un fer comment on dit (-) traditionnel?

S4 [bɛ] C'était moderne je ne sais pas le nom mais (-) c'était moderne (-) il y avait tous les boutons pour faire les différents euh:

T Et est-ce qu'il avait euh: quelque chose qui sortait du fer?

S4 Bon il y avait le: la vapeur

T Ah bon il y avait la vapeur

S4 [bɛ] oui

T D'accord oui (- -) alors vous aviez beaucoup de repassage à faire?

S4 Oui

T Et l'après-midi vous avez gardé les enfants (-) est-ce qu'il y avait des problèmes particuliers quand on a gardé les enfants est-ce qu'il y a un enfant qui par example est tombé?

S4 Non (- -) non il y avait le: le petit garçon qui voulait

81		faire quelque chose (-) et la petite fille a voulu le faire
82	T	Ah bon
83	S4	Mais ils étaient bien sympas (-) oui (- -)
84		quand j'ai dit non c'est non
85	T	Ah bon
86	S4	Ils étaient gentils
87	T	C'est bien ça c'est formidable (- -) vous êtes
88		allée chez la grand-mère?
89	S4	Oui
90	T	Et comment c'était?
91	S4	Oh [bɛ] elle avait un ferme (- -) la grand-mère
92		elle a gardé sa maison elle a gardé ses enfants elle
93		avait six enfants (-) puis euh: elle était bien sympa
94	T	Sa maison était comment?
95	S4	Oh c'était c'était (-) un vieux (-) une vieille maison
96	T	Oui
97	S4	Euh: il y avait des il y avait (- -) autres maisons
98		(- -) pour le bois pour la foin (-) la paille (-) et uh
99		(-) ah c'était deux étages puis le parterre c'était du
100		bois (-) il y avait un (- -) parquet c'est ça
101	T	Oui oui (- -) et il y avait des animaux à la ferme?
102	S4	Il y avait [bɛ] des cochons des (-) chevaux et
103		des vaches beaucoup de vaches
104	T	Ah oui pourquoi?
105	S4	Pour la viande (-) elle a vendu les vaches à
106		l'abattoir qui était là (-) pour manger
107	T	D'accord oui (-) quand vous parlez des autres maisons
108		il y avait d'autres maisons à côté de cette maison là?
109	S4	C'étaient les maisons comme dans un ferme (- -)
110		c'était: oui c'était pas pour habiter là dedans
111		mais:
112	T	Alors c'est à dire?
113	S4	(laughs) je ne sais pas le nom mais c'était euh:
114		(- -) c'était que pour les animaux en hiver (- -) ou
115		pour mettre la paille pour euh: pour que (- -)
116	T	Alors c'était pour les animaux
117	S4	Je ne sais pas (laughs)
118	T	Bon d'accord très bien (- -) et vous étiez dans
119		la maison de la grand-mère?
120	S4	Oui
121	T	Pourriez-vous décrire sa salle de séjour?
122	S4	Il y avait une grande table (-) oui la grand-mère

123		(-) elle a fait beaucoup de tricoter et les choses
124		comme ça (- -) puis (-) elle avait tout sur la table
125		elle avait la télé
126	T	Oui
127	S4	Il y avait des meubles comme les hautes tables pour
128		mettre les journaux
129	T	Oui
130	S4	Il y avait les autres les chaises il y avait (-) les
131		deux portes pour aller dans les chambres
132	T	C'est tout?
133	S4	Il y avait les têtes (- -) il y avait des têtes
134		des animaux qui étaient morts
135	T	Ah oui
136	S4	Et on a fait quelque chose avec les pour (- -)
137	T	Vous voulez dire les animaux qu'elle a envoyés
138		à l'abattoir?
139	S4	Non non c'était (- -) euh: (- -) il y avait les
140		oiseaux oui il y avait les oiseaux (- -) et
141		il y avait les (- -)
142	T	Et où est-ce qu'elle a obtenu ces têtes d'animaux?
143		on les a achetées?
144	S4	Non ils les ont tuées avec un fu fusil
145	T	Oui mais
146	S4	A la chasse
147	T	A la chasse ah bon (-) et qu'est-ce qu'on a fait
148		avec ces têtes exactement?
149	S4	Bon (-) on a vidé tout ce qu'il y a dedans (-) et on a mis
150		quelque chose dedans pour faire (- -)
151	T	Pour faire quoi?
152	S4	Pour faire (- -) je n'ai pas je n'ai pas demandé
153	T	Ah bon d'accord (laughs) d'accord (laughs)
154	S4	(laughs)
155	T	Donc (- -) elle avait une cheminée?
156	S4	(- -) non
157	T	Pas de cheminée? avec quoi est-ce qu'elle se chauffait?
158	S4	La maison?
159	T	Oui
160	S4	[bɛ] avec les radiateurs qui étaient elle avait un
161		four pour pour faire la cuisine
162	T	Un four?
163	S4	Avec du bois
164	T	Ah bon c'était du vieux style

165	S4	Oui il a fait marcher les radiateurs
166	T	Oui et le bois (-) elle l'a coupé autour de sa maison?
167	S4	(- -) Le:
168	T	Le bois
169	S4	Ah: oui oui (-) il y avait le ferme (-) puis il y
170		avait un parc qui avait beaucoup des arbres (- -)
171		une fois par an on a coupé beaucoup de bois pour la maison
172	T	D'accord (- -) c'était le fermier qui coupait le bois?
173		C'était elle ou
174	S4	Non c'était son mari et puis ses deux fils
175	T	Ah oui
176	S4	C'est tout ils ont fait tout
177	T	D'accord ils ont fait tout d'accord (- -) alors
178		je vous remercie
179	S4	De rien (laughs)
180	T	Au revoir
181	S4	Au revoir

REFERENCES

Adjemian, C., 1976: "On the nature of interlanguage systems", *Language Learning* 26.2, pp.297-320.

Aitchison, J., 1983: *The Articulate Mammal*. London: Hutchinson.

Anderson, J. R., 1983: *The Architecture of Cognition*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Bialystok, E., 1981: "The role of linguistic knowledge in second language use", *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 4, pp.31-45.

————, 1982: "On the relationship between knowing and using forms", *Applied Linguistics* 3, pp.181-207.

————, 1983: "Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies", in Faerch and Kasper (eds), pp.100-118.

————, 1984: "Strategies in interlanguage learning and performance", Davies, Criper and Howatt (eds), pp.37-48.

———— and M. Sharwood Smith, 1985: "Interlanguage is not a state of mind: an evaluation of the construct for second langauge acquisition", *Applied Linguistics* 6, pp.102-117.

Blum-Kulka, S., 1982: "Learning to say what you mean in a second language; a study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language", *Applied Linguistics* 3, pp.28-59.

Brown, H. D., 1973: "Affective variables in second language acquisition", *Language Learning* 23.2, pp.231-45.

Brown, G., and G. Yule, 1983: *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.
Canale, M., 1983: "From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy", in Richards and Schmidt (eds), pp.2-27.
———— and M. Swain, 1980: Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing", *Applied Linguistics* 1, pp.1-47.
Carter, R., 1987: *Vocabulary*. London: Allen and Unwin.
Chastain, K., 1975: "Affective and ability factors in second language acquisition", *Language Learning* 25.1, pp.153-61.
Chomsky, N., 1965: *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.
————, 1980: *Rules and Representations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Cohen, A., 1984: "Studying second-language learning strategies: how do we get the information?", *Applied Linguistics* 5, pp.101-112.
————, 1987: "Using verbal reports in research on language learning", in Faerch and Kasper (eds), pp.82-95.
———— and M. Robbins, 1976: "Towards assessing interlanguage performance: the relationship between selected errors, learners' characteristics and learners' explanations", *Language Learning* 26.1, pp.45-67.
Coleman, J. A., and R. Towell (eds), 1987: *The Advanced Language Learner*. London: CILT.
Cook, V. J., 1985: "Universal grammar and second language learning", *Applied Linguistics* 6, pp.2-18.
Corder, S. P., 1978: "Strategies of communication", *Publications de l'Association Finlandaise de Linguistique Appliquée* (AF in LA) 23.
Davies, A., C. Criper and A. P. R. Howatt (eds), 1984: *Interlanguage*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Dechert, H., 1983: "How a story is done in a second language", in Faerch and Kasper (eds), pp.175-95.
————, 1984: "Second language production: six hypotheses", in H. Dechert, D. Möhle and M. Raupach (eds), *Second Language Production*, pp.211-30. Tübingen: Narr.
————, 1986: "Language production—language contact: the significance of learners' speech", in P. Meara (ed.), *Spoken Language*, pp.28-36. London: CILT.
Ellis, R., 1982: "The origins of interlanguage", *Applied Linguistics* 3, pp.207-33.
————, 1984: "Communication strategies and the evaluation of communicative performance", *ELT Journal* 38.1, pp.39-44.
————, 1985: *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ericsson, K. A., and H. A. Simon, 1980: "Verbal reports as data", *Psychological Review* 87.3, pp.215-51.

Faerch, C., 1984: "Strategies in production and reception: the empirical evidence", in Davies, Criper and Howatt (eds), pp.49-70.
Faerch, C., and G. Kasper (eds), 1983: *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
————, 1983a: "Plans and strategies in foreign language communication", in Faerch and Kasper (eds), pp.20-60.
————, 1983b: "Communication strategies in interlanguage production", in Faerch and Kasper (eds), pp.210-38.
————, 1984: "Pragmatic knowledge: rules and procedures", *Applied Linguistics* 5, pp.214-25.
————, 1987: "From product to process—introspective methods in second language research", in Faerch and Kasper (eds), *Introspection in Second Language Research*, pp.5-23. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Felix, S., 1984: "Maturational aspects of universal grammar", in Davies, Criper and Howatt (eds), pp.133-61.
Gardner, R., and W. Lambert, 1972: *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
Haarstrup, K., and R. Phillipson, 1983: "Achievement strategies in learner/native speaker interaction", in Faerch and Kasper (eds), pp.140-58.
Harding, E. M., 1983: "Compensation strategies". CLCS Occasional Paper No.9. Dublin: Trinity College, Centre for Language and Communication Studies.
Hatch, E. (ed.), 1978: *Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
Hulstijn, J., and W. Hulstijn, 1984: "Grammatical errors as a function of processing constraints and explicit knowledge", Language Learning 34.1, pp.23-43.
Hymes, D. H., 1971: "On communicative competence", in J. Pride and J. B. Holmes (eds), *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
Kasper, G. (ed.), 1986: *Learning, Teaching and Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
Krashen, S. D., 1981: *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. New York: Pergamon.
————, 1982: *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon.
Labov, W., 1970: "The study of language in its social context", *Studium Generale* 23, pp.30-87.
Lightbown, P., 1984: "The relationship between theory and method in second language acquisition research", in Davies, Criper and Howatt (eds), pp.241-52.
Littlewood, W., 1979: "Communicative performance in language developmental contexts", *IRAL* 17, pp.123-38.
————, 1981: "Language variation and second language acquisition theory", *Applied Linguistics* 2, pp.150-9.
————, 1983: "Contrastive pragmatics and the foreign language learner's

personality", *Applied Linguistics* 4, pp.200-207.
McLaughlin, B., 1978: "The Monitor model: some methodological considerations", *Language Learning* 28.2, pp.309-32.
————, 1987: *Theories of Second Language Learning*. London: Arnold.
Morrison, D., and G. Low, 1983: "Monitoring and the second language learner", in Richards and Schmidt (eds), pp.226-72.
Odlin, T., 1986: "On the nature and use of explicit knowledge", *IRAL* 24, pp.123-44.
Poulisse, N., T. Bongaerts and E. Kellerman, 1984: "On the use of compensatory strategies in second language performance", *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin* 8.1, pp.70-105.
————, 1987: "The use of retrospective verbal reports in the analysis of compensatory strategies", in Faerch and Kasper (eds), pp.213-29.
Raupach, M., 1980: "Cross-linguistic descriptions of speech performance as a contribution to contrastive psycholinguistics", in H. Dechert and M. Raupach (eds), *Towards a Cross-Linguistic Assessment of Speech Production*, pp.9-22. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
————, 1983: "Analysis and evaluation of communication strategies", in Faerch and Kasper (eds), pp.199-209.
————, 1987: "Procedural learning in advanced learners of a foreign language", in Coleman and Towell (eds), pp.123-55.
Richards, J., and R. Schmidt (eds), 1983: *Language and Communication*. London: Longman.
Rosansky, E., 1975: "The critical period for the acquisition of language: some cognitive developmental considerations", *Working Papers in Bilingualism* 6, pp.92-102.
Savignon, S., 1972: *Communicative Competence: An Experiment in Foreign Language Teaching*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.
Schiffrin, D., 1987: *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Seliger, H., 1980: "Data sources and the study of L2 speech performance: some theoretical issues", *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin* 5, pp.31-46.
————, 1983: "The language learner as linguist: of metaphors and realities", *Applied Linguistics* 4.3, pp.179-91.
Selinker, L., 1972: "Interlanguage". Reprinted 1974 in J. C. Richards (ed.), *Error Analysis*, pp.31-54. London: Longman.
Sharwood Smith, M., 1979: "Strategies, language transfer and the simulation of the second language learner's mental operation", *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin* 4, pp.66-83.
————, 1983: "Cross-linguistic aspects of second language acquisition", *Applied Linguistics* 4, pp.192-200.
Singleton, D. M., 1987: "The fall and rise of language transfer", in Coleman and Towell (eds), pp.27-53.

Tarone, E., 1977: "Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: a progress report", in H. Brown, C. Yorio and R. Crymes (eds), *On TESOL 77*, pp.194-203. Washington, D. C.: TESOL.

————, 1980: "Communication strategies, foreigner talk and repair in interlanguage", *Language Learning* 30, pp.417-31.

————, 1981: "Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy", *TESOL Quarterly* 15.3, pp.285-95.

————, 1983: "On the variability of interlanguage systems", *Applied Linguistics* 4, pp.143-63.

————, 1988: *Variation in Interlanguage*. London: Arnold.

————, A. Cohen and G. Dumas (eds), 1976: "A closer look at some interlanguage terminology: a framework for communication strategies", *Working Papers in Bilingualism* 9, pp.76-90.

Towell, R., 1987: "Approaches to the analysis of the oral language development of the advanced learner", in Coleman and Towell (eds), pp.157-81.

Tran-Thi-Chau, 1975: "Error analysis, contrastive analysis and students' perception: a study of difficulty in second language learning", *IRAL* 13, pp.119-43.

Váradi, T., 1983: "Strategies of target language learner communication: message adjustment", in Faerch and Kasper (eds), pp.79-98.

Wildner-Bassett, M., 1986: "Teaching 'polite noises': improving advanced adult learners' repertoire of gambits", in Kasper (ed.), pp.163-78.

Yalden, J., 1987: *Principles of Course Design for Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

© University of Dublin
Trinity College

Spring 1986

14. D. G. Little and A. J. Grant, *Learning German without a teacher. Report on a self-instructional programme for undergraduate students of Engineering Science at Trinity College, Dublin, 1982-1984* (60pp.)
15. Máire Owens, *Eithne: a study of second language development* (62pp.)
16. D. Wilson and D. Sperber, *Pragmatics: an overview* (36pp.)

Autumn 1986

17. Ailbhe Ní Chasaide & Eugene Davis, *A data-processing system for quantitative analysis in speech production* (28pp.)
18. Seán M. Devitt, *Learning a foreign language through the media* (69pp.)
19. Meriel Bloor & Thomas Bloor, *Languages for specific purposes: practice and theory* (34pp.)

Spring 1988

20. D. G. Little & D. M. Singleton, *Authentic materials and the role of fixed support in language teaching: towards a manual for language learners* (26pp.)

Spring 1989

21. Seán M. Devitt, *Classroom discourse: its nature and its potential for language learning* (72pp.)
22. V. J. Cook, *The relevance of grammar in the applied linguistics of language teaching* (43pp.)

Spring 1990

23. Sera De Vriendt & Pete Van de Craen, *Bilingualism in Belgium: a history and an appraisal* (52pp.)
24. David Singleton, *The cross-linguistic factor in second language learning: a report on some small-scale studies recently conducted at the CLCS* (20pp.)

Autumn 1990

25. Paul Farrell, *Vocabulary in ESP: a lexical analysis of the English of electronics and a study of semi-technical vocabulary* (82pp.)
26. David Singleton, *The TCD Modern Languages Research Project: objectives, instruments and preliminary results* (19pp.)
27. Federica Scarpa, *Contrastive analysis and second language learners' errors: an analysis of C-test data elicited from beginners in Italian* (47pp.)

Spring 1991

28. Jennifer Ridley, *Strategic competence in second language performance: a study of four advanced learners* (95pp.)
29. Susan Abbey, *A case for on-going evaluation in English language teaching projects* (43pp.)